The Colgate-Rochester Divinity School Bulletin

VOLUME X No. 4—PAGES 255–326

Editor

OREN HULING BAKER

Business Manager

GLENN BLACKMER EWELL

MAY, 1938

¶ Published nine times each year, in September, October, November, December, January, February, March, April, and May, by the Baptist Education Society of the State of New York, at Rochester, N. Y. Entered as second-class matter April 11, 1913, at the post-office at Rochester, N. Y., under the Act of August 24, 1912. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized July 30, 1930.

¶ Copyrighted by the Baptist Education Society of the State of New York.

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2026

https://archive.org/details/colgate-rochester-divinity-school-bulletin_1938-05_10_4

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Part I

PAGE

More Than Conqueror - - - - - - - - 259

Memorial Services for Grace Haddow Beaven

What About Evangelism? - - - - - - - 269

David Jones Evans

The Meaning of Liberalism for Americans - - - 297

Willson Havelock Coates

Part II

The Annual Meeting of the Education Society - - 311

The Annual Report of the President - - - - 314

Albert William Beaven

Part III

Index - - - - - - - - - - - - - 324

To Grace—In Heaven

Easter Morning

I'd love to see the rapture in your eyes, today!
The glow of light upon your face,
The glory of your hair—
Your joy undimmed—all native to that place
You've gone to share!

I wonder what you'd say to us today
Who're still earth-bound
And closed in walls of clay
You only just have spurned.
What message would you have for us today
Who've loved and hoped and yearned
And then—have lost?

I think you'd say—if we could hear
Above the waves of sorrow gray that pound upon our ear—
I think you'd say, "I'm not away! I'm nearer far
Than on that day you held me to your heart;
For life with God doth this impart
To those who live for aye—
(Tho ages pass and time grow gray)
They cannot be away!"

Written by Mrs. W. S. Abernethy.

GRACE HADDOW BEAVEN
1887–1938

MORE THAN CONQUEROR

On the morning of April fifteenth, Mrs. Albert W. Beaven, wife of of the President of Colgate-Rochester Divinity School, passed out of life here into life there. To one of her rare spirit it could not have meant defeat,—it meant more life, more love, more freedom to do and to be, with all limitations removed. This new phase of Eternal Life was just another great adventure to her who lived always adventurously.

Mrs. Beaven, whose maiden name was Grace H. Haddow, was born in St. Paul, Minnesota, August 25, 1887. Her parents later moved to Tacoma, Washington, where she spent most of her youth until she went to New York City to study music. Returning to Tacoma, she became choir director of the First Baptist Church, during the pastorate of Reverend Herbert Judson White. She was married on the twenty-third of June, 1909, and went with her husband to the Lake Avenue Baptist Church of Rochester, N. Y., where he was the pastor-elect. For twenty years her life was closely identified with that church and with the missionary enterprise. She was a member of the Board of Managers of the Woman's American Baptist Foreign Mission Society for a time, and was a member of a commission appointed by that society, which went to Japan and China in 1927.

Since 1929, when Dr. Beaven assumed the presidency of the Colgate-Rochester Divinity School, her major service was rendered among the faculty wives and the wives of the students, and in the social life of the Divinity School, although she was widely active in the church, in the denomination, and in civic, musical, and charitable affairs in the city of Rochester.

She and Dr. Beaven and their daughter Margaret had just completed a trip around the world, visiting the mission stations of India, Burma and Japan. They also made a trip to the Holy Land, and Mrs. Beaven was an associate delegate to the Oxford Conference.

She was taken sick this last time on March the twenty-fourth, and died on April the fifteenth. She had long suffered from an incurable disease, but had for the most part kept it a secret from those outside the family. Besides her husband, she is survived by her daughter, Mrs. Jean Beaven Abernethy, of Columbia, Missouri, her son, Reverend Robert H. Beaven, now a student for his doctorate in the University of Cambridge, England, and Margaret Helen Beaven, her youngest daughter.

Grace Beaven lived above circumstances; they never chained her, they challenged her; they never bored her, they beckoned her; they never defeated her, they drew her up and out to find new ways to do and to be. She moved through life as one who felt herself "safe in the vast security of her Father's will." Though death finally claimed her mortal body, there was no mark of his grim touch upon her face as she lay clothed-upon by Immortality. There was only quiet beauty there, and the deep contentment of one who had arrived in her Father's house. As one turned away from the flower-laden casket, he was sure that all was well.

Grace Beaven's religion was a vital, glorious reality,—something to live by, something to conquer with, something to enable her to radiate good cheer and courage. The home she so largely helped to make can best be described in the words of Kagawa, who said of it, "It is the most Christian thing I have seen in America."

There was an intimate family service in the home at one o'clock on April eighteenth, when her loved ones sang hymns grown dear in deep family associations and where her children rose up and called her "blessed," and where "the heart of her husband praised her." There were children there who had called her "Aunt Grace" who, in this their first contact with death, looked on in wondering surprise that it could be so triumphant a thing.

The intimate service in the home was followed by one in the Lake Avenue Church of Rochester, where a thousand or more of her friends had gathered in loving memory and respect. As the voice of Dr. Beaven sounded clear and strong in the great affirmation of the Scripture, "I am the resurrection and the life," the congregation arose, and as the casket was borne down the aisle, her family followed it and sang with all the others:

"Christ the Lord is risen today,
Alleluia!"

Through the entire service—the songs, the Scripture, the prayer, the beautiful, tender tribute paid by her husband—there was the note of victory. There was no "sadness of farewell when she embarked." The sunlight of faith and hope and love dissipated any lurking shadow of gloom and all who listened went away with spirits bathed and with hearts re-echoing, "Thanks be to God who giveth us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ."

The tribute of President Beaven to his wife follows:

My friends:

I come to you this day with no message of sorrow. Greater than death, greater than anything on the face of the earth is the thing of which I speak to you—of God, of hope, of love, and of all this embodied in a radiant life,—one whom I have loved, one whom you have known, one in whom we have all rejoiced. To speak of her and only refer to suffering or sorrow or death would be out of place. I come today conscious of the power of God to triumph over death and sorrow and suffering. It may seem strange to you that I take part, but I could not allow anyone else this privilege. I asked for it myself.

We know now, as we did not know before, that the sickness from which she has been suffering for the last eighteen years was far more serious than any of us dreamed. How she could come so near to death as she did two years ago, and still live, neither I nor the doctors know, *but she did,* and she lived two full, glorious years; they were a sheer gift of God. During that time we took the long journey, which I almost feared for her to take, against which all her friends warned her; but she said, "I cannot bear to live the rest of my life timidly; I had rather live less years and live them to the full. I am going to go." And she did. That trip had nothing to do with this sickness so far as we can tell. Indeed, during that trip, for the first time in fifteen years she seemed to be free from her disease. Death came to her now because at last vital organs had been wasted away.

Death has come to her body, but not to her. The spirit of adventure which marked her from the very beginning was not what took her, but was what made her. She lived radiantly and gallantly to the end. For twenty-nine years she filled our home with life and joy and calm strength. No man ever received more from his wife, and no one can take away from me the memories that are mine. I think I understand a little better now than I ever did what the Scripture means where it says, "If our earthly house of this tabernacle be dissolved, we have a building not made with hands, eternal in the heavens." I think this is true. She knows it is.

There was something about her life which I have often noted and to which many have referred. There was a mysterious poise, a secret calm and power. We of the family all relied on it, and others did as well. When we came near to her, a new strength came to us. The explanation of this, I believe, was in her religion. Her faith was not

a set of arguments; it was a quiet, calm assurance of God. To her God was not something to be argued about; He was someone to be laid hold of. Looking upon her faith was a good deal like looking into a deep, quiet lake. I never saw its surface ruffled but twice. Prayer to her was just talking with God. He filled her life to the full. It was as customary for us to draw strength from her personality as it is for a branch to draw life from the vine. For myself, personally, when I was sick or tired or discouraged, her radiant smile or her cheery call as I entered the door made the whole world different.

I am saying this to you her friends, for her. This is, in a sense, her last chance to speak to you of that power by which she lived. She believed that religion is God filling the heart of a man or a woman with such strength that he or she can move quietly and victoriously on past suffering or death, and she has proved that it was so. She held that we are here to do God's will; that we should do it sweetly and seriously and quietly to the end, and that when it is ended here, we start anew over there. We know that her gallant spirit has started upon that new and beautiful adventure.

Frequently during the years of our married life we have had to stand near the shore and look out across the mysterious ocean we call death, and as we have stood there, facing the possible ending of our comradeship, we have said to ourselves,—"Such days as we have, be they few or many, we will live them to the full. We want never to be behind in the joy of our life together, and we are never going to be behind with our love or our appreciation; whenever the parting comes, the past will be certain and it must be glorious." AND IT IS.

Beyond this experience of life lies an unknown realm, it is true, but why fear it? It is not the end. On that other shore are my father and mother; our firstborn lass is there; and now she joins that group. Loved ones by the scores and even hundreds, whose faces I miss from this company, are there too. God is the "God of the whole family, whether in heaven or on earth." And when you say to me, "What do you think of life after death?" I can only say what she thought: "God is here; He is also there. Loved ones were here; they are now there. We are here; we go there. God is not different there than here; we are still within His care. God made it glorious for us here; I know He will make it so there."

So I am saying to you today what I tried to preach for twenty years in this pulpit. When a moment like this comes we have an option;

we can view it through the north, or through the "east window"; we can think only of what we have lost, or we can think of what we have. I choose the latter. I have God, I have work to do, I have beloved children, and I have memories of twenty-nine years of as lovely comradeship in the home as it was ever given a man to have—memories that turn all the lights on when I think of her. I do not doubt but that there will be moments of darkness tomorrow in the valley, but I choose to get my bearings from the mountain tops.

Prayer by Dr. William S. Abernethy follows:

We come to this moment glad that we know the word "Father." It was Jesus who said, "When ye pray, say, Our Father." We love the name "Father." It tells us of guidance and provision for our needs and constant care. And so we come with that blessed name on our lips. We wish those who love her—all the members of the family circle—were here too. This is a blessed fellowship, but we would not sorrow when those who have grown so intimately into our lives leave us. Why should we sorrow when one has gone home where some of her loved ones are? We bless thee for the welcome that was hers when she entered those gates.

We thank Thee for this blessed life, for her beautiful, radiant character, for the loveliness that shone through her eyes, for her vitality, for the things that she did and the things that she said; how she lived for others, how she took on her heart the troubles of others; what an intimate knowledge she had of Thee; for these happy memories that we shall cherish as the years go on—for all of these, we thank Thee.

We are especially thankful today for the glorious faith of these dear ones who are left. Help us, we pray, that when we pass through the "valley of the shadow of death" we too may bear our sorrows as triumphantly. God bless this thy servant, her companion for many years. They have walked together and grown into each other's lives. Life was such a blessed and happy experience, and we have all benefited as we have watched them. Now be with him, we pray Thee. There will be a tomorrow and a day after tomorrow, and other days that will be long and hard. O God, be near and comfort him.

And these daughters, God bless them. We thank Thee that so much of their mother lives on in them. We pray that Thou wilt be their support during these days, and all through the remainder of their lives may they carry on as she would like them to do. And then, we think of that boy across the water, and his beautiful wife. They are with

us in spirit today. We think of them as sitting and thinking of us here at Lake Avenue Church this afternoon. They are rejoicing too because of her life and her faith and her hopes. O God, be very near to them, we pray.

We bring before Thee her father and mother and family out on the Pacific coast. How they would love to be here today! Their spirits join with ours, and we pray that Thou wilt be a comforter to them. May they have the blessed assurance just now that their daughter's life, so well lived, will go on through the years bringing blessing to others in the years to come.

Our Father, help us to be more Christian in our attitude. If religion means anything to us, surely it should mean something at a time like this. May the faith and comfort and strength that we talk about be actually our experience. We look forward to that day when these broken ties of earth shall be made whole, when this family, torn and scattered now for a little time, shall be together. We pray Thee, our blessed Lord, that we, too, may be able to hear sometime that "Well done, good and faithful servant, enter thou into the joy of thy Lord," which she surely heard.

May God be with us all the days, until at last we see him with perfect vision, eye to eye and face to face; when we shall understand the plans of God which are hidden from us now and which some day will be revealed, and may we all the days to come be able to say from our hearts, "God is good; I love Him." Hear us, in this our prayer, for Jesus' sake. Amen.

On Thursday, April 28, 1938, at 4:00 p. m. in the chapel of the Colgate-Rochester Divinity School, a memorial service for Mrs. Grace Haddow Beaven was held at which Professor John F. Vichert presided and offered the invocation and benediction and Professor Ernest W. Parsons prayed. Messages were delivered by President Beaven, Mr. Bryan F. Archibald for the student body, and Professor Conrad H. Moehlman for the faculty.

Mr. Archibald spoke as follows:

When I was asked to say these few words, expressing as best they may, our lasting regard and esteem for Mrs. Beaven, it occurred to me that no finer tribute could be paid than that of the personal expressions of gratitude that have come directly to me from several members of the student body. We all knew Mrs Beaven and appreciated her life of gracious service here in the Divinity School. And I pass

these words on to you now, not as any complete tribute to her influence —but merely as some of the things which the students wanted to have said at this memorial service.

We all want to express our sincere appreciation of her untiring efforts to make the social life of our campus, not only successful from the Christian standpoint, but homelike and enjoyable to us all. So many of the students have said that they found in Mrs. Beaven their ideal and example of the perfect hostess! We knew her best as the charming and lovely lady who held open house for us on Wednesday afternoons; who entertained so skillfully and generously at class parties; and who vitalized every social gathering with her unflagging interest and considerate attention to us personally. Mrs. Beaven knew us all. She was interested in us. She remembered each of us by name, and could recall an amazing amount of additional information about almost any student in the school. We have listened to her talk, many times, of graduates for some years removed from the Divinity School with the same freedom and ease as she conversed with us. To those of us who have some little idea of the number of her acquaintances, all this seems little short of the miraculous.

One student put it this way: "The secret of her poise and vitality has always seemed to me to be this: She possessed an outgoing love and interest for everybody, and she actively engaged herself in making that interest count."

Mrs. Beaven possessed a marvelously rich and vital mind. She knew how to make the thoughts of her guests the subjects of her own unlimited attention. To engage in conversation with her was always a liberal education. Her interests were large and vital necessarily because she, herself, was interested in so large a number of people. As one student said this morning: "It seems to me she was the perfect hostess in this respect; she tried to keep conversation up so that no one would be embarrassed, and all would feel at home; she varied the topics of conversation to meet the requirements of all. I have always loved her for her graciousness, and have felt that few people could compare with her in endeavoring to know and treat all students alike."

Her special interest lay in the comfort and welfare of the married students. So many have expressed their appreciation of her interest in the planning, construction and furnishing of the married students' apartments. Her suggestions as to the placing of doors, partitions, etc., have meant much in convenience and comfort.

Mrs. Beaven gave herself wholeheartedly to the activities of the Coterie. Her contribution to the married women of the school was a considerable one. Possessed of a fine sense of proportion and good taste, she filled her place as the President's wife effectively and well. As one of the wives puts it: "Unconsciously, we learned many things from Mrs. Beaven. She exemplifies to me, more than any other person I know of, just what it means to be a good minister's wife. She taught me that I have, in my own right, a real, practical job to fulfill as the pastor's wife; and what is more important, she showed me by her own example how to fill that job successfully."

The quality of Mrs Beaven's lasting Christian influence is perhaps best shown in this: she never allowed her own personal problems, her long sickness to interfere with her life of service and interest in others. Never once did she mention her own trouble to cloud the social life of the school. Her sickness and death, therefore, came as a great shock to all of us. Practical, vivacious, helpful to the very last moment of strength, she refused to allow her own sickness to interfere with her usefulness to others! The quality of her faith is felt by us all as we recall her unceasing efforts, without complaint, in our behalf. Her gallant spirit of helpfulness, and the fine, gracious tenor of her life here as our hostess and friend lives on in our personal desire as ministers and pastors' wives never to cloud the lives of others with our own troubles, and to reveal in every practical way of skill and helpfulness the quality of our faith in God.

Professor Moehlman said: For almost three decades, Rochester has felt the impact of a very rare and winsome personality. Grace Beaven's life was a synthesis of love, faith, courage, and insight. She always preferred to understand rather than to explain.

More than a quarter of a century ago I was walking through the corridor of the older Lake Avenue Baptist Chuch when I heard her cheery voice for the first time. She was sitting on a step comforting a fellow-traveller on life's journey. Her naturalness and joyousness were contagious and a total stranger to her had been helped.

Grace Beaven was always active, always discovering the person in need, always sacrificing her own strength to enter into the sorrow of another. She cared for the souls of the membership of a large church. When death entered a home, she was there to see the family through. She reinterpreted the experience of death for multitudes. She was ever positive toward life, never negative. She believed there was love at

the heart of the world. Her capacity for friendship, friendliness, sympathy with the underprivileged and with any in trouble was infinite.

She kept her eye on the goal. Little criticisms could not turn her aside. She could co-operate with the opposition and never know defeat. Unafraid she walked through life, thoroughly democratic in feeling and in deed.

Love to her was not emotionalism, but purity, genuineness, loyalty, justice. She was heroic and humble—far from indifferent in the presence of wrong, far from complacent in the presence of need. I had seen her on numerous funeral occasions. She had always entered completely into the experience of the mourners. On this occasion it was so different. We were both silent until the ordeal was over on a hillside in Mount Hope. Then in her gracious way, she turned to me and said: "For years the chief mourner here has been so cruel to the beautiful, patient, long-suffering soul we have just buried! How unjust it would be to her to play the hypocrite now." That was a judgment meriting complete approval.

Mrs. Moehlman and I affiliated with the Lake Avenue Baptist Church in 1918. Almost our first great emotional experience came the following Wednesday night. Here were long lines of tables, hundreds of persons seated at them. We were newcomers. Imagine our surprise when, without warning, a hand came down between us and we looked around and up—way up—into the smiling face of joyous Grace Beaven to hear her say: "Hello Bertha! Hello Connie (to date I had been called Bennie, Mehle, Moleman and such like)! So glad to see you!" And she was off and really greeted some three hundred before the song service began. I think hundreds of persons attended the Wednesday night meetings to shake hands with Grace Beaven.

Through the years we observed her rapid growth in service to humanity. Grace Beaven seemed to be an almost perfect illustration of

> "The builder who first bridged Niagara's gorge,
> Before he swung his cable, shore to shore,
> Sent out across the gulf his venturing kite
> Bearing a slender cord for unseen hands
> To grasp upon the further cliff and draw
> A greater cord, and then a greater yet:
> Till at the last across the chasm swung
> The cable—then the mighty bridge in air!"

Time prevents a further appreciation of the qualities that characterized her. But her conquest of pain deserves a closing word.

It was a Sunday morning in the late summer a few years ago. I was preaching in the Lake Avenue Baptist Church. The theme of the sermon was: *"The Conquest of Pain."* In the audience sat Mrs. Beaven and her children. We commented very briefly upon the principal interpretations of pain. Pain is penalty. Pain is discipline. Pain is vicarious. Pain is contrast. Pain is pessimism. Pain is mystery. Pain is error. Pain is natural, needful and even useful; the leper prays: "Give me back my pain."

Thereupon we insisted that one may know all these things without conquering pain, that one may suffer a lifetime without even approaching sainthood. There is value only in the attitude the sufferer may take toward his pain. Finally, we told the story of *Broken Wings* found in Scribner's for August, 1920. The emphasis was this: "There's nothing new in pain. The point is the reaction. One may turn pain into a gift and wear it so that light gleams out of the knives that cut! Or one may be a coward and a slacker. . . . You have to choose. It's up to you. You may love life and see good days only if you cut out bitterness. Love's the necessary solvent—the antidote for poisons." And may we learn how to make a treaty of peace with pain.

The *amen* had scarcely been sung when Grace Beaven was at the pulpit stairs. "Connie, your points were" and she enumerated them all except one. I couldn't recall any. "Now that last quotation—how did it go?" The discourse had to come from the pocket. We stood there and reread it—"That's it. I have it now. *'There's nothing new in pain. The point is the reaction. One may turn pain into a gift and wear it so that light gleams out of the knives that cut! Or one may be a coward and a slacker!'"*

Pain became for Grace Beaven the background of moral inspiration and perfection.

"Jerusalem the Golden" was sung in closing but many present wondered how the fruitage of such a life could ever be fully harvested.

WHAT ABOUT EVANGELISM? (*Concluded*)

David Jones Evans

I.

In the February number of this bulletin, I presented somewhat sketchily a few of the aspects of revivalistic evangelism. It is proposed here to follow with greater detail the implications of some of the theses there presented. A practical program for evangelistic activity is one of the great needs of the hour, and while much that is written today concerning evangelism is of value, there is surprisingly little that is at the same time comprehensive and consistent with the awakening social conscience to be found in increasing areas of our church life. There are perhaps at present more minds concerned with the problems of theoretical evangelism than there are evangelists, and that may prove eventually not to the disadvantage of the Christian program; but there is a growing pressure from within the churches and from the situation that confronts Christianity from without that calls urgently for a type of evangelism that in message and method is relevant to our present needs. One is aware, to be sure, that the older forms of mass evangelism persist not without some degree of success in many communities; and that modifications of various sorts have been introduced by way of visitation, houseparties, trained groups, "life changers," etc.; but should the success of this older form and its modifications be multiplied, the demand for a newer type would by no means be decreased. And that for very good reasons, Christianity faces today a condition for which the addition of a few thousands to the membership of our churches is of slight significance, however important it may be to those who are added. The ethical and spiritual atmosphere of the entire world is tainted with anti-Christian ideologies, and the most Christianized sections of the globe are seething with social and political discontent, so that we are apparently headed for the "dark ages" or for a "renaissance." Perhaps no type of evangelism is adequate for such a crisis, but least of all the sort that is content with increasing the quantity of church membership and is not concerned with the quality of Christian living. The periodic "spurts" and the high emotional pressure, the occasional special efforts and the artificially aroused interest in the average revival cannot seriously be regarded as an effective method of coping with the spiritual disorders of a civilization in

quest of solid foundations. Professionalism and occasionalism are by no means calculated to allay the mounting distrust which, whether deserved or not, is directed toward much in our religious life that once was accepted without question. It is a thousand pities that we so easily fall into the traditional conventions out of which all vitality has long since disappeared. We are observing "times and seasons," following "manners and customs," repeating creed and prayer which only emphasizes the poverty of our religious invention, and possibly serves to conceal the depleted state of our spiritual resources. Whatever we attempt by way of evangelism must of necessity become one of the constant activities of the church, one that engages not a few experts, but the pastor and his flock for every working day. The worship of God, the duty of Christian education, the creation of a Christian fellowship and the stimulation of Christian philanthropy may be considered as the objectives which receive the permanent emphasis in our churches as they now function,—these are the obligatory constants of our organized bodies; but interwoven with these permanent duties, implicated in the essential logic of these activities, arising out of the same idealistic impulses, conforming with the ends sought in all of them is evangelism, the sharing with all sorts and conditions of human beings the tender mercies of God which are increasingly poured out upon all without distinction. To make of this an occasional objective dependent upon casual circumstances is to deny the serious quality of the Christian aim and to deprive our churches of the sense of marching under the stress of urgency toward the goal of making disciples of all the nations.

Neither can practical evangelism limit its aims to the so-called middle class. Not since the days of Wesley and Whitefield have the churches been deeply concerned for the multitudes of the underprivileged. It is obviously unfair to state the matter in this bald way, for the industrial age was but in its infancy in their time, but they had a very decided enthusiasm for the unchurched masses of their day. The succeeding century witnessed the tremendous increase of the factory system and with it, all of those disturbing dislocations of populations, changes of environment, habits of association, conditions of work and perhaps more significant than all else, the tilting of the social beam to the advantage of the ascending few and to the disadvantage of the descending many. For this situation the churches were not prepared, and the ground then lost has never been recaptured. Only for a limited time in the United States did there seem to appear a favorable excep-

tion during the years of the open frontier, when evangelists pursued the enterprising pioneers with the gospel and the Christian institutions they had left "back home." With the progressive industrialization of the United States the same tragic cleft that separated masses of workers from the church in other countries appeared here as well. And democratic America can render no better account of her stewardship in this respect than some of those countries where equality of opportunity has never been advocated even as a theory. Whatever the intention of the older evangelism has been, it failed to penetrate beyond the fairly well-defined limits of established respectability. It is true that the Salvation Army and many individuals have broken through the conventional lines of ecclesiastical propriety, but not with sufficient resources either of personnel or equipment to change the situation to any promising degree. Such fine enterprises as Hull house in Chicago and Kingsley House in East London are so exceptional as to make Jane Addams and Muriel Lester jut out of the ordinary landscape like St. Francis in the middle ages. Perhaps a long period of experimentation is unavoidable until one hits upon the most effective technique for evangelizing these millions but if we had the will and the compassion to perceive the harassed and distressed multitudes, it is likely that our skills could have been earlier deployed in the service of our love. Let the dead bury their own dead. It is ours here and now to think of evangelism only in the inclusive terms of all groups that form human society. It is more than refreshing to reflect upon the fact that in many missionary areas, Christianity has been true to type in finding the readier response among the low castes, the outcasts and the hard pressed. This ought to recall the situation of the first two or three centuries of Christian history. The reported jibe of Celsus was largely true, as had been the words of St. Paul almost two centuries before—the power of Christian salvation made itself felt largely among the poor, the imprisoned, the enslaved, the inconspicuous masses that plodded through the drudgery of life. We shall recapture this emphasis if we are wise in our own day and generation. How much time we spend in searching through those identical centuries for the fine points of ecclesiastical polity, sacramentarian emphasés, episcopal ordination and the like, and miss the truly significant fact that faith in Jesus Christ was opening prison doors, delivering the oppressed and setting captives free! We have our choice of emphases. We can reduce Christianity to a traditional cult by finding a "thus saith the

Lord" in history for every syllable of our creeds and for every rubric of our ritual, or we can go back to the carpenter shop in Nazareth and see a toiler lay away his tools in order to go forth in quest of other toilers whom he challenged to become sons of God. If modern evangelism could accept the sublime simplicity of Jesus, and venture forth in the name of human life to call all men irrespective of social status, or cultural attainment into a fellowship of creative sympathy and reverent worship, we should then recover some of that gladness of heart possible only to those who have been humbled and exalted together by a great love. This is the specific quality of fellowship on the Christian level—a common comprehension of surpassing grace that dissolves all differences and fuses the highest human qualities into united gratitude. Evangelism will find the way to build this bridge across the cleft or to the dishonor of modern Christianity endure the humiliation of seeing millions of human beings seeking salvation in ways that are not only strange to our eyes but utterly foreign to the Christian interpretation of life. The countless multitudes that today are seeking more abundant life apart from traditional Christianity live in those lands made sacred to us by saints, reformers and martyrs. Shall we, too, guild the tombs of the prophets, canonize the saints, revere the reformers, and fail to catch the universally human note that rang in their ethical and spiritual demands and echoed in the undiscriminating quality of their service. Peter Waldo and the poor men of Lyons, St. Francis and his fratres minores represented more than a slight variation from the Catholic type of doctrine, they represent that saving aberration from the accepted status quo that has rescued Christianity again and again from its tendency to crystallize into a fixed form of life and culture, even as Jesus in Galilee represented a glorious aberration from the Jerusalem form of Godliness. The modern history of Roman Catholicism, Greek Orthodoxy, Anglicanism and Nonconformity reveals the reluctance with which they all approach the revolutionary social passion of great masses of the people, and for the most part they are inclined to damn with opprobious names, what is probably the noblest quality of our common humanity—that refusal to be herded like swine to the pre-established troughs and stys. In spite of all the destructive excesses which characterizes these upheavals, basically they represent the spiritual hunger that differentiates man from the beast. It is not to the credit of any church that it has joined in the stupid hue and cry that would crucify rather than understand

such movements. The innate timidity of established institutions may discourage the hope that churches will finally awake to the opportunity and responsibility for interpreting and guiding these uprisings toward definitely spiritual ends; but is it useless to hope that evangelists will arise from among the adventurous youth in our churches who will dedicate themselves to the stupendous task of lifting this all but universal social passion into the realm of the Christian? I may be pardoned for injecting here an illustration which answers the question in the affirmative. A very few years ago in the Colgate-Rochester Divinity School, three of the outstanding men of the graduating class, inspired by the teachings of Walter Rauschenbusch, dedicated themselves to this identical type of service. They would go out in precisely the same spirit as others who were dedicated to "missionary" work, their aim was to Christianize the relationships in which the tensions occur in industrial organizations. They were ready and well equipped for such an experimental adventure. They were willing to accept the lowest possible minimum compensation that would sustain health and energy, but alas! there was no organized society among our churches, whose function it was to examine and locate young men of that type, and individuals could not be found in sufficient numbers to "back" such an enterprise. It fell through, but the young men were there, the need was there, and the churches were asleep! But it wasn't a sound sleep after all! There isn't a denominational organization of any magnitude that does not hear at least annually from its appointed commission on social service. These commissions as they now function in our general bodies are largely fact-finding and fact-interpreting groups. The resolutions which they usually present are saturated with the Christian attitude and the Christian purpose with reference to those areas in our social and political life which are as yet non-Christian, and so well have they succeeded in educating the consciences of their respective groups that we can count upon an increasing number to take a positive Christian stand with reference to war, international relations, race prejudice and economic injustice. This has been a very significant type of service, but one raises the question as to whether the time hasn't come in each separate Christian body to unify in substance the reports of the commission on social service and the commission on evangelism. Why assume that these fields are distinct, and that the message of the evangelist need not coincide with an enlightened social conscience. Evangelism for today cannot ignore the content of the reports of our commissions

on social service. One question further, this time with great trepidation, whether it is not now practicable to merge in some loose way these various denominational commissions on social service and evangelism not merely for the funding of relevant information but in order to lay the groundlines for a future board or society whose function shall be comparable to that of our Home and Foreign Mission societies, but in the specific field of social evangelism. Some such procedure would seem to be due.

For the older type of evangelism suffered as did all of our activities from a too narrow conception of the fields of experience in which religion ought to function. The expression—saving souls—in part betrays the limitation of that conception. It is a limitation which rests upon the common fallacy that religion is an end in itself. It is to this fallacy that we owe the specialized institutions of religion with their divinely appointed priesthoods and sacraments, their authorized articles of faith and their divinely ordained control over salvation and damnation. The complexity of life and the impossibility of perfect obedience to an absolute demand such as love to God and neighbor, the conflict between conscience and state, the tension between the "is" and the "ought" have contributed to the ease with which the fallacy persists, and the resort to divine absolution at the hands of God's vicars, simply perpetuates the error that life compels one course of conduct and religion affords temporary relief through forgiveness and the promise of eternal salvation at the end. This solution manifestly produces at least two results, the continuation of life conditions that do not ease the tension between things as they are and as they ought to be, and the persistence of a specialized institution that emphasizes the distinction between religion and life. The church has been "the ark of safety," "the city of refuge," and any number of metaphors that signify flight from reality. This is partly the reason why the church has been able to affirm complacently any form of political and social organization which happened to be dominant at the time, whether slavery or feudalism or nationalism, and why religion has perpetuated cult forms and intellectual notions that life has outgrown. When life gets turbulent and great ground swells of human emotion carry the race a little further toward abundant living, when pioneers of thought push out to frontiers that are unfamiliar, then the church and the churches either attempt to arrest the process or reluctantly assimilate the new knowledge and accept the new facts. The fear of life in the present often prompts

a retreat to an idealized past, or to the finding of security not in the activity of conflict but in the passive anticipation of some apocalyptic triumph. We have witnessed in our own tempestuous generation this timidity, one might almost say, this rejection of life in its stormy processes, and the manifest tendency to retreat to some earlier stage when all of life was synthesized as in the thirteenth century for example, when according to Henry Adams there was a meaning in the totality of things that since then has disappeared. We can fully appreciate the greatness of Innocent III, St. Francis of Assissi, Thomas Aquinas and other great scholastics without wishing to play with the hands of the clock, and especially without encouraging the churches to flee from present reality into some sheltered enclave of life where we are tempted to apotheosize a mood into a system of dogma which assumes that present conflicts have no meaning but are the last lunacies of a decaying world. All the traditions of theology and worship make this the easiest path to follow. We can retreat to our symbols and Shibboleths, we can easily persuade ourselves that we are not of this world, that our only function is to witness against a world rapidly ripening for judgment, we can take to ourselves the martyr complex without the glory of martyrdom and wait until the storm is overpassed. Or we can enter upon the most difficult task of creating a truly worldly church, a church that is ready to participate in all the creative forces of life, willing to attempt the mastery of all the factors that mold human character, responsive to the eternal love of God, and submissive to the judgments of God which are true and righteous altogether. In the official report of the Oxford Conference in the section on Church and Community there are two paragraphs that are illuminating for this particular issue. One paragraph is under the rubric, The Call to the Church, and reads as follows:—"The church is under obligation to proclaim the truth that the disintegration of society has one root cause. Human life is falling to pieces because it has tried to organize itself into Unity on a secularistic and humanistic basis without any reference to the divine will and power above and beyond itself. It has sought to be self-sufficient, a law unto itself. Nor is there any hope in the ascription of sacred quality to nation or state or class. A false sacred, a false God, merely adds demonic power to the unredeemed passions of men. Though bringing about temporal and local unity it prepares for mankind an even worse and wider conflict. The recall to God in penitence must stand first. . . ." ". . . The first task of the church, now as always, is to

make known the gospel, and to assert the claim of Jesus Christ as the incarnate Word of God to the lordship of all human life." And again under the same rubric:—"There is an urgent call to the church today to re-establish close relationships with the common life of the people in the midst of which it is called to work. The word of God must not only be preached; at any cost it must be made actual. Indeed only as it is thus being made actual can it be said to be completely preached. Today men are often more likely to criticize the church than to criticize Christianity; this is due in no small part to the fact that the church has lost touch with the everyday activities and problems which fill men's lives. To the outsider the church appears to be a society of people interested in a specialized activity which does not need and does not engage the interest of all. Religion is just one activity among many for those who are inclined that way. Men see no necessary relation between the moral struggle of society and the gospel of Christ. The church is not wholly to blame for this situation, since many spheres of the common life in which it once took the leading part have now been taken over by the community or by the state. But these changes only challenge the church to seek new areas and new means for the redemption of common life." Following this paragraph are ten practical suggestions as to how the church can not only preach but "make actual" the gospel of Christ.

These two paragraphs do not issue from identical sources. They are parts of one report but express divergent views within Protestantism with reference to the function of the church. The first quotation represents a view that in my judgment tends to isolate the church still more effectively from human life. It postulates a God and a Savior and a Church that are insertions into life from an above and a beyond which cleaves reality into two disparate planes. There is no ordinary channel of communication. It is only by miracle that the beyond can impinge upon the here, and it is only by a corresponding miracle that the here can approach the beyond. Life in itself has no sacred quality, but is subsumed under the utterly secular and is without hope of redemption until it is lifted up and out of the present and here. The second paragraph with the following practical suggestion is from a different stratum of human thought. It assumes without assertion that human life and institutions are not separated by a chasm from the life of God. Creation, providence and redemption do not make different demands upon the divine will. Jesus and the gospel are simply clearer

revelations of what is written everywhere in life, and the difference between the sacred and the secular is not a real one. It is no small tribute to the power of Christianity that these divergent views could be presented in a single report. We are evidently on the way toward growing an ecumenical mind. The difficulty of that process is no small one. We might as well face the fact that two types of logic are here involved, and it is only Christian courtesy that consents to house them under one roof. If the first section quoted were pressed to its ultimate conclusion we should again have a narrowly specialized church devoted in doctrine, ministry and worship to religion as an end in itself; under which circumstances evangelism could be nothing else than plucking brands from the burning—the bare announcement of a message of salvation and judgment—a distinct retreat, as I see it, from the fundamental postulates of Jesus. Home life, education, industry, the state, charity, art and recreation are once more consigned to the convenient catchall of secularism, and the soul of man is left in solitude to become either the object of God's love or the prey of demonic forces. This solitary soul stripped of all notions of derivation, relation and education is pure abstraction and as mythical a concept as "demonic forces"—possible to think about but utterly foreign to experience. Evangelism cannot influence disembodied spirits, but it can speak to human life, richly immersed in all the factors that promote growth and choice, effort and aspiration, health and freedom, control and mastery—that is, to human life *in situ*.

II.

This brings us to the task of attempting to define positively the nature and object of modern evangelism. Let us say that evangelism is an organized effort on an ecumenical scale to implement the basic attitudes of Jesus for the salvation of life. Much of this can be omitted for the sake of convenience, and we have this briefer form—evangelism is an effort to implement the basic attitudes of Jesus for the salvation of life. There is much here that cannot be taken for granted. In reality it is tantamount to saying that evangelism is an effort to implement the insights of Jesus for the salvation of life, and to many that deprives Jesus of his divine distinction. There is also the difficulty of determining what attitudes or insights were basic for him. Both of these issues are fundamental and must be faced if the new evangelism is to be at all significant. Let us look first at the question of Jesus'

basic insights. There can be no dispute about the apocalyptic frame of reference in which we find His life and teachings. The Kingdom of God was a supernatural magnitude, it was soon to appear, in fact it was at hand. In the light of this truth, men were urged to repent and believe the good news, this was the only adequate preparation for the divine event, this type of conduct would meet the approval of God, and would deliver men from the judgment that would fall on the unrepentant. It is impossible to say whether this frame of reference, this anticipation of immediacy was present with equal intensity as a background for all his teaching or not, there are some precepts that remind us more of the teacher than of the prophet. It isn't impossible to think of his prophetic intensity as rising and falling according to the degree in which his spirit was moved. There were moments of anger and indignant denunciation when the tension was at its highest, and also stretches of peaceful and calm teaching that betokened unruffled serenity. He was tender poet, blazing prophet, calm teacher, all in one. To assume that we can understand his words without consulting his moods is like asserting that we can interpret a glorious epic with the aid of a grammar and a lexicon only. But let us assume that the frame of reference was invariably present, to what extent does that invalidate any teaching not directly involved in the apocalyptic myth? Is God any the less the loving Father or the just Judge, because the Kingdom did not immediately come? What but love is relevant to the "togetherness" of life whether the end comes soon or late or not at all? What qualities or lack of qualities are added to or substracted from covetousness whether the judge be at the door or in a far country? What can time do to affect the loyalty of the many-talented or the disloyalty of the one-talented? What has the love of little children to do with tomorrow's judgment day? Does the destructive power of avarice vary with the shortening or the lengthening day, and do fear and lust, irreverence and hate, hypocrisy and impurity, humility and trust depend upon the calendar for their essential qualities? These are some of the attitudes or insights characteristic of Jesus, and it is all but impossible to think of salvation apart from the embodiment of them in human character. They are qualities, or virtues, graces or attitudes that validate themselves in experience. "He that heareth these sayings of mine and doeth them," "Why call ye me Lord, Lord and do not the things which I say," "if thou art offering thy gift at the altar and there rememberest," "except your righteousness excell the righte-

ousness of the scribes and Pharisees," "why do ye not of yourselves judge righteous judgment,"—evidently Jesus expected these ethical and spiritual qualities to grow in his followers; they were the good trees that bore the good fruit, and the bad trees that bore the bad fruit would be cut down and thrown into the fire. There is not the slightest hint of any sort of substitution for achieved goodness in all that he taught, nor that salvation was anything else than the possession or the aspiration and effort to possess these qualities. Where there had been shameful failure and willful rebellion, as in the cases of the prodigal son and the "woman who was a sinner" the forgiveness as a gift of love was immediate and conditioned only upon sincere repentance. Such were some of the basic insights of Jesus. There is no point, so far as I see, in discussing how much or how little of all this he did or did not inherit from historic or contemporary Judaism. He was free enough in his attitude to arouse the hostility of established religion, and there is no reason to question his originality in the realms where originality is most significant—in self-dedication to and appropriation of the qualities that had been largely matters of theoretical discussion only.

Let us assume for the time being that we have succeeded in indicating some of the real ethical and spiritual insights of Jesus, and that we have shown that they have a validity for life apart from any apocalyptic pattern into which they may have been fitted, is the Saviorhood of Jesus established thereby? Or do we need some special act on his part that will be accepted by the heavenly Father in lieu of moral failure on our part, an act which will complete some transaction whereby it is made possible to transfer the guilt of our transgressions to him, and the virtue of his obedience to us?

Many have so believed and still believe. However, we cannot overlook the fact that no self-consistent theory of the atonement is found either in the New Testament or in history. The religious background and popular religious beliefs, forms of social and political organization have all played their part in contributing to the instability of any given theory. It is difficult to think of Saviorhood as dependent upon so shifting a thing as interpretation which necessarily fluctuates with the changing factors in human thought. The contsant element in it all is that He died. He gave his all, the last full measure of devotion, and we scan each insight in the light of that complete dedication to the will of God. The cross creates no new attitude but it illumines and

intensifies every insight with that surpassing light which never was on sea and land. The love of God was in him from the day he left Nazareth until he gave up his spirit, but the loyalty of that love met the supreme test in Jerusalem where the hatred of his people, the bigotry of the priesthood and the cowardice of his disciples conspired against him. He met the test, paid the exacting price of love, and every precept which had fallen from his lips began to glow anew. Love your enemies, forgive man their tresspasses, blessed are the pure in heart, be not anxious about tomorrow, have faith in God, what shall a man give in exchange for his soul, he that putteth his hand to the plow and looketh back is not fit for the Kingdom of God, take up they cross and follow me,—how these words penetrate through the thick indifference of life into new depths of longing and heights of aspiration when read in the light of that cross forever luminous with love.

"Evangelism is an effort to implement the basic attitudes of Jesus for the salvation of life." If we have removed a few possible criticisms to this definition, we may proceed to a more detailed examination of some three of these basic attitudes, his fellowship with God, his estimate of man and his dealing with sin. It is important to note that Jesus' approach to these fundamentals was entirely practical. The theoretical element appears nowhere to determine his attitude. There is no discussion of religious issues, no finely drawn distinctions based on severely logical methods. He is not seeking a rational support for his faith, but living a full life of complete trust and devoted service. His teaching was a clear reflection of his experience, and his authority was not of the schools but of the laboratory. How much he had learned in home and synagogue of the traditions of his people is but of slight concern for he taught in his own name what life had brought him. When we are told that the people marveled at his doctrine because he taught not as the Scribes, we have an invaluable testimony to the "first-hand" quality of his instruction. He was not afraid of the insights derived from practice and demonstrated in the daily contact with man and things. It is this particular flavor that sends us back to him again and again as to a refreshing fountain. It is probable that most of us, for instance, have read what is called the Sermon on the Mount at least a hundred times, and the hundred and first time will bring us that delightful sense of surprise which reveals its inexhaustible creative quality. It is not merely that we analyze afresh the ethical and spiritual content of his teaching as such, but that we catch something of a loving

and adventurous personality who lived as no one ever dared to live before. We hear his words, but more than that we see him, and then his words come back redolent of a life of beauty, purity, courage, sympathy and love. If the theologian in us sometimes asks for more system, we shall need to remember that his chief concern was life, and life is ofttimes casual, irregular, uneven and full of shocks. If we walk with him away from the sequestered paths of academic peace into the rich diversity of life, we shall see how much local color his sayings have absorbed. That crabbed faultfinder, that gossiping village, that Pharisee loquacious in prayer, that reckless boy, that pious snob, that eager child, that father gazing daily down the road,—who can forget them? And from these casual contacts he speaks the words that never die, of God, of man, of sin and salvation.

It is the intimate quality of God's relationship to man and things that make noteworthy Jesus' teaching in this regard. He assumed that men were sons of God, and could become like him. This was his ideal of ethical perfection. Our Father in heaven, your Father which is in heaven, was the way to approach God in prayer. With no sense of constraint whatever men could go to God sincerely, humbly, trustfully and confident that what they needed was already known to him. But they must go with no hypocrisy, with no superfluity of words, and with no malice or resentment against a fellowman. They could ask and seek and knock without being disappointed and without being deceived. This is praying out of life, not by rote nor by custom, but out of life's daily need. This Father God was glorified in the good works of his children, and the pure in heart and peacemakers were peculiarly close to him. But the intimacy of this relationship was far from the flippant and the familiar. The Father's name was to be revered and nothing associated with his worship could be commonplace, neither city nor temple nor altar could be lightly spoken of. His Kingdom was the chief end of all spiritual seeking, and his will the holiest aim of earth and heaven. Thus did he summarize the highest aspirations within experience. This Father in Heaven was not an absentee from his world. He clothed the lilies of the field with more glory than ever shimmered from the royal robes of Solomon. The impartiality of rainfall and sunshine were his gifts. No nestling sparrow ever fell unnoted to the ground, the birds were fed, childhood's angels always beheld his face, and every human hair was numbered. This is the providence of God in familiar things. But this kindly Father set his face against the evil

wills of men. He was to be dreaded of those who proudly scorned his will, feared by those who presumed to come into his presence with the smirk of complacent self-righteousness upon their lips and by those who beneath a cloak of piety robbed and plundered the helpless and the weak. The careless fatling building greater barns and the pampered glutton gormandizing in the presence of misery would be called to account, for the goodness of the heavenly Father could not condone the vicious, the unholy and the inhuman. This is the judgment on familiar and all too human types. Love and wrath, grace and condemnation are united in the heavenly Father for the highest moral ends.

As significant for evangelism as any insight of Jesus with reference to God is his attitude toward sin. The goodness of the Father in heaven could not be indifferent to the trespasses of his children. His perfect righteousness asks for perfect obedience. It is tacitly assumed that human beings are such as to make possible therefore obligatory such obedience. There is nothing in the teaching of Jesus that hints at an obstacle in the mind of God that hinders his direct dealing with transgressions as they appear in human life. He forgives when the sinner comes in penitence and with a forgiving spirit. Stubborn refusal to forgive makes the Father's forgiveness impossible, not only so, but it arouses his indignation as in the parable of the servant who had much forgiven him but who refused to forgive the little in his fellow servant. Apart from the difficulty involved in the "eternal sin," there is no confusing indirectness anywhere as to the way in which sin is acknowledged and forgiven. There is no element of the courtroom with the judge upon the bench and the culprit at the bar. Least of all do we think of a victim that must be offered to placate offended majesty. The relationships are personal, not legal. All the formal patterns of thought are laid aside and the patient Father deals without any type of intermediary with the erring child. Son, said Jesus to the paralytic, thy sins are forgiven thee. Her sins which are many are forgiven, for she loved much, said Jesus to Simon concerning the woman who was a sinner. Neither do I condemn thee, said he to the woman whose accusers had lost "face" and slunk away. The immortal story of the headstrong son embodies this insight in a form that humanity will not permit to perish. Here is wise fatherhood aware of the rebellion that even rational restraint will engender. Tragic blunder, pitiful disillusionment and a final kindling of the undying spark leads the boy homeward. What contrition and what a drab future he has humbly pictured

for himself. But it is not to be, indeed it cannot be, for even aged eyes can see afar and aged feet can run, and compassion that endureth all things and believeth all things knows how to heal a broken heart and restore a recovered son to his own place and dignity. What a daring story and how we love it! But how reluctantly even now do we permit it to replace the more forensic, the more theological, the more morbid, and the less realistic ideas of traditional Christology. It is possibly the vindictive quality of our own attitudes that compels the persistent choice of theories involving altars and victims, judges and culprits in preference to the simple yet profound insight of Jesus. Forgiveness by its very nature is essentially personal and direct, and in this as in other attitudes Jesus is the dauntless pioneer of our faith. Has modern evangelism the courage to follow him?

The corollary to Jesus' teaching concerning God is his estimate of man. If God were Sovereign man would be subject, feudatory, serf, slave or whatever status in man that would be the correlative of the authority in God. The heavenly Father does not rule a household of slaves but guides a family of free sons. The reverence for personality so prominent in the attitude of Jesus is not predicated upon the value of an isolated individual as such, but upon the value of the individual as a member of the divine family. He is interrelated by means of his common origin in God with all other men. His welfare or his illfare is not something that terminates in himself alone. So sensitive are the bands of love and so inclusive, that self exclusion or expulsion by others from the common fellowship disturbs the concord of the entire family in heaven or on earth. The publicans and sinners expelled by pride and arrogant hypocrisy must be reinstated, and when one is restored, there is joy in heaven among the angels. Zachaeus too was discovered to be a son of Abraham, and if publicans and harlots entered the Kingdom of God before the righteous pharisees, it was because the former knew that their sins had expelled them, and forgiven they hastened home; the latter had through pride and self-righteousness excluded themselves, and knew not the need of forgiveness, hence they tarried outside in unfeeling self-complacency. The denial of kinship, the disdain of relationship, the arrogance of class and clan and race are not only disintegrating forces in human society, but are equally fatal to the religious interests of the human family, for denial of unity and common life is a denial of God. Only a clan god can support a clan aim. Neither can the value of personality be sustained save by the

belief in one Father in heaven. Practical atheism does not hesitate to reduce man to the level of a thing. A thing without freedom, without rights, without duties save obedience. How can you say to a thing, —"thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, with all thy mind and with all thy strength, and thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself!" If I jump the hedge with all the silly flock, then how am I of more value than a sheep? If my soul can be exchanged for material and temporal security, then I am no more than a lump of coal or a bar of steel. If little ones can be caused to stumble out of their heritage of freedom, innocence, love and normal growth without inviting the millstone and the deep sea, then childhood is no more significant than puppyhood. Who dares reverse the dictum of Jesus about the child and the Kingdom? This is the battle field of Christendom. Here lies the issue for churches and evangelists. How utterly irrelevant is the Lambeth Quadrilateral even in its latest and most insinuating revision, or any other ecclesiastical issue when compared to this collossal *issue*. Is it possible to think that the churches of the future will find a basis of union in the purposes which they together will attempt to achieve, rather than seeking to find one in the past, a method which tempts each division of Christendom to interpret history to its own advantage? The so-called Apostles Creed and that of Nicaea fail to embody any essential insight of Jesus either with reference to God or to man. They are cast in an already fixed theological mold, and one might sincerely repeat them as articles of faith without being moved in the last degree to incarnate in life the attitudes without which Jesus would not be Jesus. God as universal Father, and all men as sons of God are well nigh outworn Shibboleths of "liberalism," but these Shibboleths have never been taken as seriously as they deserve. They have been accepted as abstract truths to which our minds give glad assent, rather than as ideals to be actualized. Liberalism and orthodoxy alike are guilty of substituting indolent speculation for the practice of religion. It is the task of modern evangelism to make these dry bones live.

In his insight as to the nature of sin we meet again that unconventional way, from the standpoint of theology, of dealing with one of life's realities. We have in the story of his temptation and in one of his parables as well as some other places a reference to Satan and the Devil and many of the miracles are concerned with the casting out of demons. It is probable that the apocalyptic frame of reference had in it a kingdom of Satan which the Kingdom of God would conquer as it

came. One can see all this in the stories told of him, but in his actual dealing with sinners and his teaching about sin there is a direct realism which treats sin as a matter of failure and positive transgression in the realm of human relationships. Adultery, murder, hate, covetousness, pride, irreverence, superfluous and profane speech, hypocrisy are all treated as matters of human origin, human error and sin to be overcome by repentence towards God, acceptance of his forgiveness, and an effort to eradicate it from the human heart. For this was its residence, that realm of hidden thought, imagination and desire. "From within, from the heart of men, the designs of evil come: sexual vice, stealing, murder, adultery, lust, malice, deceit, sensuality, envying, slander, arrogance, recklessness, all these evils issue from within and they defile a man." The catalogue isn't complete and as he went about doing good he discovered additional forms. But in spite of all that he knew about human beings he does not seem to have despaired of his mission, nor to have grown gloomy over the mystery of evil. He believed that the vilest could be restored through awakened contrition and forgiving love, and he sent away in confidence of a new possibility those who came to him conscious of their sins. His optimism in this respect was almost romantic, but it seemed to be justified. The sins which he denounced most severely are not the common sins of the vast majority, but the subtle sins of the highly privileged. Religious pride, virtue on parade, piety in piffling punctiliousness, ostentation in worship, failure to distinguish between gnats and camels, and all that brood born of the tragic failure to discern between form and reality, garb and grace, prayer and pose, profession and sincerity. For this type the Gehenna of fire was the only appropriate reward. For evangelism the matter of note here is the practical approach, and the fundamental insight that sins are uncontrolled human impulses and must be repented of in the sight of God, and eradicated through his love. There is no indication that he thought of the human predicament as having been produced by forces that were not amenable to divine and human control. Seeking and saving the lost was action within the sphere of experience, and was essentially the restoration of human life to its normal relationship. This was salvation, and the insight he had into the nature of sin as it affected life in relationship to itself and God, along with his knowledge as to how man could be recovered and restored constituted him the Savior, the servant of God in creating a society in which the heavenly Father and

all his children could live in harmony, the will of the Father being done, as in heaven, so on earth.

Now all that has been said here concerning these three basic attitudes of Jesus is open to criticism. I may be permitted to anticipate some of that, not in order to forestall it, but that the nature of the positions taken here may be better understood in the light of possible criticism, with special reference to evangelistic activity. Many will be disposed to say that this is all Pollyanna stuff from the halcyon days of a liberalism now decadent. Too much Santa Claus in God, too flattering an estimate of man, too soft an impeachment of sin and sinners. The world is tottering on its last legs, nations are engaged in bloody undeclared wars, totalitarianism is militantly subjecting entire populations to the goose-step theory of the state, economic injustice is splitting communities into warring camps, atheistic communism is blatantly advertising a complete and satisfactory human life apart from any notion of the Christian religion, nationalism and secularism are intensifying the cleavage and reducing the content of the sacred in the world's life, it is no time to propose the implementation of such insights as an adequate conception of evangelism. We must have more "realism," more fear and dread, less optimism, more mystery, less love and more judgment, less promise and more threat, more cross and less Sermon on the Mount,—these are some of the objections one can reasonably anticipate, for they are already crystallizing into a sort of litany. If all this means more seriousness in religion one can say heartily Amen or even Hallelujah! There can be no question as to that need. But if it means that a drastic revision of the point of view is necessary, then that requires further consideration. Let us ask ourselves if the mood in which these objectives arise is as a matter of fact normal and universal, or is it a local phenomenon that has enjoyed rather favorable conditions for spreading. The dialectic theology has its modern origin in Kirkegaarde, a Dane as melancholy as Hamlet, and has had the extraordinary fortune of being expanded by the minds of Karl Barth, and Karl Heim both of whom stood in the crater of the volcano that devastated Europe in the World War and since. In history there is a striking parallel to this sort of situation. Augustine wrote his City of God while the Vandals were devastating North Africa, and were even at the gates of Hippo. It is not a query that can easily be turned aside as to whether a theological treatise produced under such circumstances can contain an impartial estimate of the liberalism it opposes.

The close relationship to hyper-Calvinism gives it a vogue which would probably be denied to a less familiar form. Calling names, of course, has nothing to do with the validity of a point of view, and he who contents himself with pointing to the origin of a given criticism may have accomplished something, but not very much. Let us then ask if there is any hope of more seriousness for religion in exchanging the Father God of Jesus for the "Wholly other" God of the new-old theology. I confess that there is more fear and dread, but it isn't the reverence and awe of religion, rather is it the dread of a terrible irrationality that paralyzes all attempts at a reasonable apprehension of reality. I seem to lose all sense of any possible comradeship, the "beyond" is so far, and the "above" so high, that any faltering notion as to why such a God made the world and me turns into the drivel of a simpleton. The natural world and the natural man are so deprived of any significance in themselves that they are doomed to a sort of perpetual puppetry save for the miracle of revelation, and that miracle requires another miracle in order to be comprehended. This is to increase one's terror at the expense of one's reason, but I repeat this is not an accession of religious awe. On the other hand, if I really believe in the Father God of Jesus, I do so not because of any self assurance as though I had assisted in bringing the idea to light, far from it. It too has its difficulties, and try as I will, the dark line that even Jesus saw in the Father's face again and again haunts my thinking, but my thoughts are not transformed into terror, for a dark line in the Father's face is not like a dark chasm that only a miracle can bridge. Then, too, my natural life on the natural earth has glimpses that make me less forlorn. I don't feel suspended over nothing, and while many griefs and sins, ignorance and error, folly and self-will beset my path and stunt my growth, yet the life I live in familiar converse with my kind has many premonitions of the fuller, freer life discovered to me in Jesus and his heavenly Father. I have no sense of shock when clearer light streams across my path, but my gratitude is none the less sincere, though in my thoughtful moments I include in my thanksgiving the good earth, the laws of nature and of man, and all that prepares me to anticipate more gifts of grace. Reverence and awe and thought and love are thus blended into harmonious unity. And if I could clearly see that the catastrophies of this generation were the judgments of God, I would not on that account attribute less love and grace to him, nor think of present violence as a

visitation of his anger, but rather of that inexorable relation between action and reaction, deed and consequence, attitude and result which love itself has established, for love has no caprice and knows no way of separating one generation from another. The violence we do to love comes back to us, and this it is that makes it a serious thing to live, and beyond this there is no religious awe, but only nameless dread.

It is being said too that this emphasis upon the value of human personality is too flattering, that even Adam still in Eden deserved no such estimate, and as for his posterity it is blind leniency alone that does not see the festering corruption that seethes in man and all his works. Condemnation rests upon mankind like a brazen cloud, and the atmosphere he breathes is muggish with the fumes of sin. Therefore all his works are vanity, there is no good in them and they deserve to perish. As for the long story of man's struggle toward reason and integrity, the wistful feeling after beauty and truth and goodness, the degree of order and discipline found in the home and state, this too is meaningless save for some vestigial remnants of grace that were not withdrawn in the primal curse. Man has done nothing, nor can he do anything to mitigate the misery of his lot and all this emphasis upon the value of personality is either a perverse misreading of the Word, or else a prolepsis, an anticipation of things to come when grace has again been poured out. This curious bit of reasoning, or perhaps I should say revelation, assumes that God was in the world and with man until he sinned of his own free choice, then withdrew so completely that all the subsequent efforts of man to grow and to become, to feel after God if haply he might find him were Godless and worse than vain. The apparent aim of such criticism is to sharpen the sense of guilt in man and to increase the sense of the glory of God. The danger is that it does neither, or else succeeds in creating a situation that is worse than that it seeks to cure. To be sure there is no basis in thought or experience that God ever withdrew from man and the world he created. This is to exalt a myth into a sober doctrine, and to confine one's range of exploration to a small segment of the human race. It is to attribute childish petulance rather than glory to God. Neither does such criticism move in the right direction for increasing the sense of personal and social obligation and responsibility. It moves backward not toward realistic thinking but toward the mythical, and that with the apparent aim of producing a sense of guilt as an end in itself. This is a degree worse than that guileless type of humanism which advises people to be

kind and exhorts them to lift themselves up to new spiritual heights by pulling on each other's boot-straps! The sense of guilt doesn't function in a vacuum. It has reality only when one's intelligence has grasped the meaning of life's inter-relations, and one's conscience has become sensitive to the "oughts" of communal living. It is only as we can think of a holy and loving God as a member of the same complex of life, as we ourselves live in that we really know what it is to sin against him.

The direction towards which this sort of criticism points is sacerdotalism. It postulates a church wherein alone the World of God is heard, and his grace dispensed. It draws an undeviating line between the saved and the unsaved. It assumes an authority in recognizing and interpreting the will of the Eternal in a manner approximating infallibility. The Word becomes to all intents and purposes a sacrament, and the minister a priest. The sanctuary becomes the retreat and the refuge of God and his elect. It is an old story. Often and in many lands have nations and priests sought to confine the Almighty to a temple, altar and a rite. But there was always a tragedy awaiting the attempt. The religion was usually suffocated within its own precincts, the lamentations and anathemas of its votaries notwithstanding. It was the bold and erratic prophet that carried religion into the market place and related it to the ephah and the shekel, to the needy sold for silver and the poor for a pair of sandals. Jesus was welcome neither in temple nor synagogue, and neither rabbi nor priest spoke a good word for him. His insights with reference to God and man were simply not religious, they were too broadly human, too inclusive in their sympathy for all sorts and conditions of men, and for all the areas of human experience, and for every day in the week. Tides of advancing life sweep on and often leave our human temples stranded in some desert place. We may make pilgrimages to these shrines and recall what once they held, but we cannot tarry long nor wail nor pray, for only silence reigns, and the God whose name was recorded here, if he were the Living One is out in the throng and press of life where is the living temple not made with hands. This is, too, the story of our theologies, our rituals, our liturgies, they confine a living fragment of the truth for a little time, and then their day is over. Returning to them is a beautiful act of loyalty, but if we expect them to reanimate, to reinvigorate the life of the spirit, we shall be disappointed. We must take the path of Jesus into the midst of Life's toil and sweat, into its

vulgarities and profanities, its tragedies and comedies, its blasphemy and its worship, there to find the syllables of a living creed, the litanies for a new confession. It is a species of atheism to make religion an end in itself as it is profanity to revile the human race or any part of it. The trumpet blasts of judgment are always sounding and are always to sound until all men know that God is love, and love binds all men into a common life.

III.

Thus far I have said that evangelism must be a constant rather than an intermittent activity of the ministers and churches; that it must include all types of human beings; that it must define its objective as the complete range of life's capacities; and that it must consider itself as an effort to implement the basic attitudes of Jesus for the salvation of life. The matter of implementation is now to be considered. I shall omit here those forms of evangelism that have special areas in mind, where "settlement" houses provide for a wide range of activities and interests, and other particular types requiring personnel and equipment not available for the average church. I have in mind the church and community familiar to us all. I am assuming only that it has a field or constituency for its evangelistic effort and I am excluding from consideration the programs of education and worship. Not that these are not to be considered as evangelistic forces, but for the sake of clearness I am thinking of the "field" in terms of people old and young who are not involved in any program of the church. This implies to begin with a very definite and persistent effort on the part of the minister to make the church aware of its unchurched consistency. Sometimes a community wide religious census is a practicable way of getting fairly accurate reports of non-members. The pastor's personal visitation program is another way of attaining similar results. Much the most effective way is patiently to educate the membership to the point where there interest in their own friends and in their neighbors leads them to submit names and addresses to the minister. This is only a beginning, and for the average Church not a very easy job at that. There is much complacency to overcome, sometimes a rather snobbish reluctance to encourage the assimilation of new people—the groups are so well pleased with themselves that strangers would be considered interlopers, this too must be modified or eradicated if possible. What is of most importance is that this simple beginning

should be something so casual and so unofficial as scarcely to be noticed—it must be taken for granted as the normal outlook of the church. It is this unostentatious work, continued month after month and year after year that gets into the blood stream of the church. Without any particular technique except the steady pressure of this becoming aware of its unchurched constituency, a foundation is quietly laid for further work.

The next step, and this is not a chronological next, but a logical, is preparing the church to receive its discovered possibilities. This is not always easy either. There is much that hinders a church from opening wide its doors to the outside. If a group is wealthy or distinguished for culture, or fairly homogeneous in any particular task or outlook, there is a tendency to limit the interest to those of similar standing. But of all places and institutions, surely the church would be the last to give this "snootiness" any recognition. The minister himself must be sure that his group humbly bows before the greatness and goodness of God, and bows so low that differences in wealth, culture and social status vanish into nothingness. If worship cannot actualize democracy, then worship and democracy are mere words! All the activities of the church are supposed to be creative functions for a life of common fellowship the world around, and if there is failure in that respect about its very doors, the missionary interest of the group, if any, is nothing much beyond sentimental pretense. Here is the place where one of the fundamental insights of Jesus becomes obligatory. His estimate of human personality must become a conviction of the Church. The worth of every human being in the sight of God must be translated into terms of evaluation and recognition on the part of the church. This is how the church can become the champion of the underprivileged, the stout contender for every human right, the leveler of all incidental and trivial distinctions in the name of Jesus in whose sight every one of these little ones is a child of the heavenly Father. This is the basic evangelistic factor, the worship of God as the Father universal and its corollary the love of man as a member of the divine family. It appears, then, that evangelism begins in the creation of a truly evangelistic church. Every pastor will face his own particular problem here. But if he loves the church for what it is and for what it may become, he shall see the fruit of his patience, the reward of his toil—a group of men and women and youth becoming increasingly sensitive to the needs of others and devoting themselves to Christian

friendship for all sorts and conditions of men in the name of Jesus of Nazareth, the friend of publicans and sinners.

Next in logical order is the task of making the outside aware of the Church and its dominant interests. This, in part, will depend upon the skill of the pastor in publicizing the ministry of the church, in part, upon common sense in the matter of organization. The average minister prefers dignity to sensation, and most churches do not encourage the bizarre stunts of which some ministers are capable. But a wise use of advertising media, attractive sermon titles—that advertise the church and its attitudes and not the preacher,—the distribution of handbills by the scout organizations, the modest announcement of a series of sermons with their titles on cards that can be given from door to door or to individuals, and especially, the "delivery of the goods" according to the announcements—these are all simple methods of developing an awareness on the outside as to the services, and particularly as to the spirit of the church towards human life and needs. The minister is seeking to make the community church-conscious, and specifically conscious of its interest in every man and his problem. It is only in this way that misapprehensions of all sorts can be removed, and any minister who knows his community can give a long list of these misapprehensions, ranging from the absurd to the shocking, from the trivial to the tragic. But it is worth time and patience to clear them up, and to substitute for them the assurance that the church has a disinterested interest in every human being because it is the society of God seeking to build in human life a habitation for God in the Spirit.

The organization required to prosecute the actual work of evangelism need be no other than the ordinary machinery that keeps touch with the entire membership the year around. If the membership is considerable, it ought to be divided into groups the head of which is a deacon, trustee or any other responsible official or member of the church. Such divisions or groupings are more normally determined by the localities in which the membership lives. It is just such an organization which is formed annually for the purpose of raising the "budget," except that it is permanent, and its particular business is to extend the friendship of the church to newly discovered families and individuals by making simple, friendly calls and reporting them to the minister. The groups can be guided by circumstances as to when these friendly calls should be made, but they definitely must be made if the church is to have a steadily ongoing evangelistic program. I

am not saying that these groups should themselves evangelize, the wisdom of the pastor must decide that, but I am positive as experience can make one, that these friendly visits systematically made and reported to the minister lay a broad foundation for an evangelism that can become a constant function of the church. They not only open the door for the pastor, but frequently these visits create such an interest in the church that the congregation is augmented from time to time, and opportunities are more readily made for personal interviews with the pastor.

Another form of organization for the carrying on of an increasing program of evangelism is the silent committee. This is a matter for the discretion of the minister. He can usually select a few men and women and young people upon whom he can depend for information regarding people who could be encouraged to come into his study for personal conferences. This silent committee need never meet, the instruction necessary can be given privately, and if the minister sets apart a given time every week for these conferences, he will find himself engaged in personal evangelism from year's end to year's end. If in addition he can conduct a class for church membership he will be doing evangelistic work in a very effective way apart form his pulpit ministrations. But that he cannot neglect if he is to do the full work of an evangelist. It is still the custom in many sections of the country to point each sermon toward an appeal. This, of course, is not an indispensable matter, but, personally, I never feel that a divine service closes properly without indicating that the doors of the church are open. There are many churches in which the matter of entrance to the church seems to be an insoluble mystery. There is neither invitation nor notice in the pulpit or bulletins, and no evidence that any one is expected or wanted. This is probably due to the fact that the dignity of worship used to be disturbed by the untimely exhortations and the excessive zeal of the evangelist. This is wholly unnecessary in a church whose pastor and people are devoting themselves constantly to this task. But an invitation to unite with the church, or to confess faith in Jesus Christ can be as dignified as any part of the service. It may be well to raise the question as to what is proper dignity for the church at worship. Does it mean the stiffness and formality of a fixed ritual that must be rigidly adhered to, or does it mean the worship of God as the God of the living, who even in the most stately ceremonial is still the Heavenly Father seeking his children. No law, of

course, can be laid down, but my own conviction is that churches lose immeasureably by assuming that evangelism, entrance to the church and confession of faith are seasonal activities.

Not that any church is to overlook the advantage that accrues to it by reason of the special emphasis that is placed upon Christian tradition in different seasons of the church year. But the tendency to limit evangelism to these particular times must be resisted. The excessive interest in Christmas and Easter is an indication of a trend toward sacerdotalism, as is the noticeably increased attendance upon communion Sunday. But if the church and pastor agree to use particular months or weeks for special evangelistic emphasis, whether it be Christmas or Easter or any other season, some suggestions as to a wise use of the time may not be amiss. As far as my experience goes, it is best not to call in any aid from outstanding pastors and evangelists. It is rather a time to deploy all the organizations of the church for attaining the evangelistic goal. The groups and circles, societies and classes can renew with added urgency the friendly calls with the special end of attendance upon services in view. Prospective members may be brought to a friendly dinner, where afterwards they meet the pastor for specific instruction. Different groups can take charge of the services, conducting devotions, responses, song services each in its own way, or in consultation with the minister, who may wish to point the service in the direction of his brief message. This type of activity need not continue more than from one Sunday to the next. A preceding week could well have been spent in dinner meetings with different groups, so that at the end of the two weeks, the entire church has been tied in, geared up with the work. This is a far more effective way to evangelize than listening even to the greatest preacher as night after night he drives home his message and makes his appeal. The more we can do to avoid any taint of professionalism in the matter, the better off we are. This, in my mind, is the greatest objection to what is called visitation evangelism. The trained group can hardly avoid a more or less stereotyped form of approach, and I don't believe that even the most skillful approach from any one of a trained group has the value of a friendship in cultivation for some time. This high-pitched friendliness, this implemented insight of Jesus is, when all is said, the very basis for the evangelistic task. When any group of believers attain even in an imperfect degree these traits of simple faith in God, sincere interest in human beings for what they are in themselves, the experience

of love in forgiveness, the will to embody Jesus' scale of values in their own lives, they have passed from death into life through Jesus Christ. Such a group led and organized by a patient minister will live contagiously in any community. It is the lack of these centers of contagion that often tempts communities to indulge in the spectacular circus methods that are so frequently associated with evangelism. "The realm of heaven," he said, "is like dough which a woman took and buried in three pecks of flour, till all of it was leavened."

IV.

In closing this paper it might be well to take a survey, as far as it is possible to do, of the unchurched multitudes in the U. S. of America. We are under some disadvantage here as no accurate statistics are available for 1938. The best we can do is to consult Luther Fry's very valuable analysis contained in his volume—The U. S. Looks at its Churches—which includes the religious census up to and including 1926. It is probable that the ratio between the church population and the unchurched has not shifted to such an extent as to make these figures the less significant, except perhaps in the case of the Sunday School where a decline of some proportions is probable. In 1926 there were 26,649,962 young people under the age of 19 that were not receiving any systematic religious instruction. This represents 55.1 per cent of the total youth population under nineteen years of age. Any decline in the number of those receiving instruction in religious living is obviously a matter of grave concern, and increasingly serious when we consider that youth everywhere is being subjected to types of propaganda which deny the relevance of Christian democracy for modern life. These fields are certainly "white unto the harvest."

Looking at the population as a whole, and placing the adult age at thirteen and over, Mr. Fry finds that the entire adult population increased 19 per cent in the decade 1906–1916, while the accessions to the churches increased 18.6 per cent. In the decade 1916–1926, the adult population increased 17.2 per cent, while the accession to the churches increased 17.3 per cent, indicating no significant loss or gain, but registering the fact that the churches were making little if any progress in gaining upon the population.

There is perhaps more importance to be attached to the figures which indicate a decline in the ratio of church membership to the total population of our metropolitan centers of 25,000 and over. In the year 1906,

66 per cent of the people in these areas were in the churches, in 1916, 61 per cent, and in 1926, 59 per cent, a decline in twenty years of 7 per cent. Considering the continuous drift of our population to industrial centers it is probable that the curve is declining with some acceleration.

The slight gains registered outside of these metropolitan centers afford some degree of encouragement, but not to the extent of justifying an attitude of complacency. In these areas 51 per cent of the total adult population were in the churches in 1906. In the year 1926, this percentage had increased to 53. This of course is a very broad average, subject to increase in many communities and decrease in others. I have before me some figures furnished by Rev. J. D. Ross regarding a very favorably situated county in New York State. In 1930 the population outside of the county capital was 38,023 and of this number not more than 12,000 or less than 33 per cent were in the churches, and there was an abundance of churches, probably an overabundance.

Returning to the more general statistics of Mr. Fry, we find in 1926, that of the total adult population, (those of 13 years of age and over,) there were 55.4 per cent in the churches, leaving 44.6 per cent on the outside. Reducing these percentages to actual figures, we obtain the following result:—

The total adult population in 1926 was -	79,969,669
55.4 per cent - - - - -	44,319,504
44.6 per cent - - - - -	35,650,165

Whatever the changes are which have taken place since 1926, there is no reason to conjecture that the ratio of the unchurched has appreciably decreased.

No one assumes that the kingdom cometh by statistics, and one may readily grant that these figures do not tell either the worst or the best about the religious situation in the United States, but it is impossible not to see the dimensions of the challenge flung at the feet of our churches.

It would be useless to speculate as to the proportion of these unchurched which lies within reach of our churches, and what proportion constitutes a challenge to other types of Christian agencies. This much is sure, evangelism has an important, nay an indispensable service to render.

(This is the second and concluding article on evangelism by Professor Evans)

THE MEANING OF LIBERALISM FOR AMERICANS

Willson Havelock Coates[1]

It is supposed to be the mark of a realist to point out the relative ineffectualness of ideas in directing human action and to emphasize the sovereign power of impersonal forces and men's desires. Yet a comprehensive realist must take into account the fact that impersonal forces and human desires are themselves the raw materials of ideas. Ideas do not spring full-grown from the brain of man, but come into the world from the impact of external forces upon the primitive urgencies of the human mind. In such a genesis they must become bound up with man's emotional nature, and there is, consequently, to the people who possess them, a presumption in favor of their relevance. Although ideas which exist in the public mind whether as institutions or beliefs may be impotent to alter materially the operation of cosmic or social forces, they do have, nevertheless, an intrinsic power which is sometimes as stubborn as the natural forces which they cannot push aside. It is true that they frequently harden into clichés and traditions which become outmoded, but as vehicles for action words and customs which carry the emotionally charged associations of the past have an enormous authority and a great power to move us.

For Americans, one such emotionally charged word is "liberalism." Certainly, in spite of much banter at the expense of liberals, the word still carries prestige, a prestige probably greater in the United States than in any other country of the western world. This is due not only to the fact that our earliest traditions are liberal, but also to the fact that the term has so nearly escaped association with any particular party's point of view. A large section of our middle class has appropriated the term for its very own and has applied it to a "middle of the road" attitude towards political and social questions, and in this country even the conservatives really like to think of themselves as liberals. As to our left-wing groups, though the word was, for them, decidedly not one of approbation for a time, the activities of the new dictatorships have induced them to think better of the liberal and to regard him as a possible ally.

Although the word "liberal" may, thus, be still in good repute, one

[1] Associate Professor of History, University of Rochester.

ought to face the possibility that it has retained its good standing rather fortuitously, and that liberalism is fundamentally outmoded. If, for example, liberalism were solely a product of eighteenth century conditions, and if it had been so committed by its early exponents like Milton and Voltaire and Hamilton to contempt for the masses, or by its later ones to a patronizing attitude towards them, in spite of its apparent advantages in American thought, it would be outmoded. Professor Laski believes that liberalism, whether in Europe or America, is inescapably connected with its bourgeois origins and that it cannot pass beyond the limits within which it was at first confined. "As an organized society," he says, "the liberal state, at bottom, had no defined objective save the making of wealth, no measurable criterion of function and status save ability to acquire it." As soon as we attempt by the liberal method to effect a transformation of the liberal state as we have known it, he finds that liberalism is "the prisoner of the end it had been destined to serve." Professor Laski notes, however, that the principles of liberalism were so phrased as to make a strong appeal to all but the old privileged orders because the middle classes needed lower class support in order to liberate themselves from the aristocracy and from the absolute state. When he goes on to imply that those general principles have validity only for the middle classes who used them, he does not carry conviction. Ideas, after all, are not cast in a fixed mould by their matrix, as Professor Whitehead shows when he depicts their extensive adventures. There is no reason to suppose that the liberal idea, like other such general ideas, has had no evolutionary development. A brief excursion into its history will reveal the extent to which the idea has continued to adapt itself to changing times.

Liberalism is historically a composite of several different movements which frequently have been antagonistic to each other. Seventeenth century puritanism was one of its antecedents, and eighteenth century rationalism, the philosophy of natural rights and the social contract theory form its intellectual basis. Democracy, constitutionalism, utilitarianism and nationalism are all characteristic expressions of it, and any one of these ingredients may at times be in conflict with another. Such diverse personalities as Hamilton, Jefferson, de Tocqueville and Walt Whitman were all exponents of liberalism. The difficulty is to find specific beliefs which could be said to make up the common political creed of liberals. There are some underlying assumptions com-

mon to them because they stem from the same rationalist tradition, but what seems to link them together in practice is a technique of politics or an attitude of mind rather than a fixed political theory. For any one group, liberalism must manifest itself in clear-cut terms, in a popular program and in the kind of abstractions which have warmth and meaning for the masses of men. When it finds its concrete expression through Hamilton, for example, it does not fulfill its function and expire with him, but remains manifestly viable and evolves a different expression in Jefferson. In other words, liberalism transcends particular liberal theories and programs, and does so because its dynamic is the concept of growth. This dynamic is apparent in Hamilton's belief in the progressive betterment of society, although he thought this could best be promoted by a strong government which favored an aristocracy of moneyed wealth. It is also apparent in Jefferson's belief that each generation should be free to formulate its own basic laws, although it assumes what appears to be a somewhat static form in his policeman concept of the rôle of government, appropriate as this concept was to the agrarianism of his day.

In de Tocqueville, the famous French contributor to 19th century American thought, the essential spirit of liberalism is found in purer form than in his American predecessors or contemporaries. He achieved this through a unique capacity for intellectual detachment which accompanied his zeal for liberty. Never quite concealing a nostalgia for aristocracy, he was able to recognize and accept the coming of democracy and to condemn its authoritarian opponents, observing that "the principal aim of good government is to bring about the welfare of people, and not to create what may be called a kind of order in the center of their wretchedness." On the other hand, while analyzing with great insight the weaknesses and dangers of democracy, de Tocqueville did not lose faith in the power of intelligence to mitigate those evils. Although he did not have the personal qualifications for accomplishing such a mitigation in practical politics, his was an urbane and civilized approach to problems of a social and political nature. It is the resilience of his mind rather than an adherence to formula which gives a timeless quality to his liberalism.

Usually, however, the expressions of liberalism in the history of American political thought have taken on dogmatic forms and have probably, because of the peculiar limitations of human nature and the blind spots of their sponsors, been the more efficacious for their time.

There is, moreover, a natural tendency for each element of the liberal doctrine to have its special advocates, and for men to differ in the emphasis they place upon various aspects of the liberal creed. For example, there are the champions of the democratic idea, there are the defenders of the Constitution strictly interpreted as the best safeguard for the people's liberties, and there are the partisans of nationalism. All these concepts are part of the liberal faith and each needs its exponents, but the exaggerated or exclusive development of any one leads to the destruction of the liberal spirit. The early manifestations of liberalism, like the social contract theory, or the belief that liberty is inherent in the individual, or that government is only a necessary evil—all generally accepted in the early nineteenth century—served their time well, but when they persisted as dogmas, their exponents were in reality abandoning the liberal spirit. However, the fallacies and exaggerations which these dogmas of necessity contained were exposed by critics who, at the time, were automatically regarded as antagonists of the liberal tradition; but since this exposure in the long run had its salutary effect on the dogmas, we come to the paradox that liberalism gained in maturity from the functioning of what was regarded as an anti-liberal tradition.

Indeed, from the beginning, liberalism has gained from its opponents. It is undoubtedly linked most closely in Europe with the anti-absolutist traditions of the past built up by the privileged and rising middle classes in their struggle against the monarchy. But royal absolutism has made its contribution to liberalism by challenging theocratic government, weakening the hold of the privileged aristocracy and occasionally standing for popular as against upper class interests. The gifted defenders of slavery in the southern states demolished the social contract theory, ridiculed the doctrine that liberty is a natural inheritance and described the state as a form of organization natural to man and not as an artificial and mechanical creation. In their attack on the liberalism of their day, they displayed a more profound understanding of the relation of the individual to society than contemporary liberals possessed—an understanding which liberals since their time have generally acquired. Most Americans may not now be able to analyze in all its complexity the meaning of liberty, but there is much evidence to show that the average American does not any longer regard it as a possession which man brings to society ready-made, but rather as a privilege which he acquires as a member of society. He has lost the old feeling that there is

a basic antagonism between the individual and the state and he has begun to understand that various forms of social organization and political control may actually release individual energies and extend liberty. If the tendency of which this is an example has been correctly analysed, it means that American liberalism has drawn from sources other than its own tradition and that it has been receptive to criticism of its main precepts.

On the whole an analysis of the history of liberalism in the United States reveals the fact that its early professions have not rendered it inflexible, and that its original associations with the middle class have not perpetually condemned it to be merely the defender of bourgeois privileges. It has stood for liberty, as its name implies, and, by and large, it has assumed that the maximum of human liberty is to be achieved by the empirical method rather than by the application of *a priori* standards. This pragmatic attitude towards affairs is rightly regarded as characteristically American, for, although American political history abounds in formulas and catch phrases, they have usually been given a very practical content from the time that the Puritans abandoned the tradition of the large estates and class stratifications into which they had been born, through the history of the frontiers and the accelerating pace of the machine age. Rigidity of thought, and, for that matter, too closely-knit reasoning, have never made a wide appeal to Americans since qualities like these neither allow for practical considerations nor give sufficient scope to the illogicality of human behavior. Finality may be described as the great American heresy. It appears often enough, but it is essentially alien to the spirit of the people. Hence, in regard to the problem of liberty, Americans are in general predisposed to accept the necessity of moving from one phase of social evolution to another in order to continue to stand for it.

What this point of view involves, in the first place, is a willingness to experiment. There is a tradition favoring the experimental method in politics in American history. The colonial settlements, the Articles of Confederation, and the American Constitution have themselves been described as experiments. This does not mean that particular suggestions for experiment, including the idea of an American Constitution, have not been bitterly opposed. The biting phrase, "playing politics with human misery" was used by ex-President Hoover to denounce a suggested experiment, but it is apparent that the method, in his mind,

is honorable and quite normal to Americans, for otherwise he would not have referred to Prohibition as a "noble experiment."

There is, of course, a possibility that the method, despite the sanction of usage, is a mistaken one. Mr. Henry Hazlitt has detected flaws in it which he analyses with shrewdness and penetration. In general his view is that there is no way of testing, for example, the validity of a particular piece of legislation intended to bring about economic recovery because its influence cannot be isolated from the many other factors which may be promoting the same end. This would be true, *a fortiori,* of any one of several legislative enactments all designed for a similar purpose.

It must be admitted at once that the analogy between the experimental method in politics and that in the scientific laboratory is quite inaccurate. It can always be maintained, without the possibility of refutation by scientific proof, that the desired result of a political experiment has been attained in spite of and not on account of the experiment. But this is not an adequate reason for discarding the method, since it is quite possible to test the intrinsic merits of experimental legislation without reference to its professed purpose. Besides, legislation can always be amended, it can be repealed or in some cases allowed to fall into disuse if it is discovered to be harmful. In the case of a constitutional provision which does not always work well, such as the separation of powers principle, it can at least be partly circumvented.

Experimentation on the body politic cannot be tried lightly and the common sense of the people can be relied upon to prevent its frivolous use; but unwise experiments are, of course, always possible, though some of those who say we cannot permit ourselves the luxury of political experimentation are merely concealing their satisfaction with the *status quo* or their belief in a policy of drift. No doubt a case, convincing to many, can be made out against the method, but its real defence is that it is not a luxury but a necessity if a liberal democracy is to obtain. It provides an educative experience for the American people which cannot be denied them and which cannot be acquired in any other way. A few examples will serve. It was certainly worth demonstrating by the practice of rotation in office that politics is a skilled vocation and that honesty is not an adequate substitute for knowledge. We learned from the experiment of the initiative and referendum that, for most legislation, representative rather than direct democracy was the only workable system in the modern state. In all

probability, only a trial could have convinced the majority of the American people that national Prohibition was not a satisfactory solution to the liquor problem. The process of learning, especially when a whole people is engaged in it, is necessarily slow. There are many who are wise before the unsuccessful political experiment and there are always some of these who despair of the people's ever achieving political wisdom. But we know today that from the political immaturities of liberal democracy we can turn only to the swashbuckling ineptitudes of dictatorship whose errors may be dangerously humiliating to the whole régime and must be concealed by bluff and bravado. The mechanism of democracy can better absorb the shock of error, for mistakes are likely to involve only the prestige of a party or the self-esteem of an individual leader who can be displaced. Moreover the process of educating a democracy by political experimentation does not always have unfortunate consequences. Much legislation projected in the spirit of experimentation has had good results and it is the opponents who have become wise after the experiment. The method can be employed on a small as well as a large scale in the American system, for, like the late Justice Holmes, we can regard the states as forty-eight social laboratories. Willingness to experiment has become and will continue to be an indispensable part of the American liberal method.

Modern American liberalism involves, in the second place, a realization of group antagonisms within society and a determination to resolve rather than to suppress the inevitable social conflicts. The idea of conflict has, in fact, been an axiom of liberalism from the beginning, but it was the conflict of individual wills which the early liberals envisaged. Mere order for its own sake, especially when imposed by authority, did not appeal to them, but their concept of the state was by no means synonymous with disorder. The life of the state was to them an expansion of the competitive economic life of the middle classes, and they were inclined to assume, not only that the conflict of egoisms was best for society in the long run, but that conflicting egoisms resolved themselves into a spontaneous harmony. This is quite different from making a virtue out of mere violence, although in a thoroughly American thinker like Walt Whitman the very turbulence of the democratic spirit was a guarantee of progress. The history of violence in the United States, whether exercised by the power of the state or by the individual, is, perhaps, an indication that the line between legitimate conflict and violence is not easy to draw. That the distinction exists,

however, has always been assumed by American liberals; otherwise they could not have assumed the compatibility of individual conflict and orderly government.

Other kinds of conflict Americans, in the early part of their national history, were reluctant to recognize. The conflict of social groups in a liberal state and even political factionalism were not considered natural. Political parties, of course, had soon to be accepted, but the reality of class conflict was for many decades disguised by sectional antagonisms and only since the late nineteenth century has it been more generally recognized. The development of this insight into the nature of society came with the emergence of American liberalism from an early faith in the value of the clash of individual wills into a more organic conception. With this emergence, too, came a growing realization of the importance to liberty of the right of the unhampered organization of groups for their own betterment and protection. However, the transition to a more realistic liberalism is not yet complete. We all know that American anarchistic individualism dies hard and that there is a reluctance to accept the reality of class conflict in the land of opportunity. But we are approaching the practical and therefore typically American view that not to recognize the reality of class conflict in the liberal state is as dogmatic and obtuse as the view that class conflict is the only important social force leading inevitably to the time when society will rend itself in class war. Indeed, by acknowledging the existence of class conflict, we have taken the first step towards a practical resolution of it.

To resolve conflicts is certainly not an unfamiliar task for liberalism, for what saved the early liberal's faith in the spontaneous harmony of egoisms from being hopelessly naïve was his belief in toleration, which in practical affairs becomes the spirit of compromise. But the philosophy of "live and let live" came to be too simple for the modern world of large scale industry and was being more honored in the breach than in the observance. The harmony of egoisms and classes could no longer be spontaneous, and the technique of liberalism now had to be extended and to be used by government in order to promote it. What this means in the case of industrial conflicts is only just beginning to appear. It does not mean the use of government fiat for settlement at any cost, but implies a spirit which makes freely negotiated agreement possible and the employment of government to induce such a spirit. Governor Murphy of Michigan, in speaking of those who had

urged him to use force to put down labor unrest, said, "At no time did they appear to recognize that machine guns are always the last refuge of the undisciplined, impotent officials in times of crisis and that patience and tolerance invariably demand far more courage and self-control than the vain, bloody exhibitions of weakness which go by the name of 'action.'" This is spoken in the true liberal tradition. It is the method most likely to result in settlements which will work without producing feelings of aggrieved humiliation on either side. But it must never be assumed in the liberal state that any kind of settlement represents permanent justice for all parties. A disposition to regard settlements as fixed would lead to irritation, followed by panicky methods, upon the reappearance of labor unrest or an expression of dissatisfaction by either party to the settlements. In other words, the inevitable recurrence of social conflict must be recognized. There might even be a justifiable suspicion that its prolonged absence would, to bring Walt Whitman up to date, be a sign that the spirit of freedom was beginning to atrophy.

Having analysed the techniques of American liberalism, we may now ask what more specifically the techniques are designed to achieve. Why should we continue to experiment in politics and tolerate the persistence of conflict which perpetually involves solutions that are seen in retrospect to be no more than temporary adjustments? We do so in order to secure, or at least to approximate equality. The idea of equality has from an early period had an honored place in American social history. It was one of the generally accepted assumptions of American thought about the nature of man, and was understood to mean, not that all men possess equal natural endowments, but that they possess in common certain human qualities for which they merit equal respect. The idea took on practical significance in the effort to maintain equal rights and opportunities for all in the economic, political and cultural aspects of social life. Yet equality has not been precisely the goal of liberalism. Indeed, some liberals regarded liberty and equality as to some extent in conflict, and if a choice was necessary, the bias of liberalism was in favor of liberty. But the history of industrial capitalism has made possible a deeper insight into the relationship between these two, whether regarded as ideals or conditions, and has borne out the brilliant intuition of Rousseau that it is the constant tendency of things to destroy equality. We know now that in order to maintain liberty itself, there must be a constant effort to restore

equality. We know that in order to sustain or promote the virtues usually associated with the middle class liberal, we may have to curb those same virtues when they take an aggressive form. The purpose of neither the old nor the new liberalism is to impose a dead level of equality. Its purpose in America has been and continues to be to ensure that measure of equality which alone makes possible the development of the individual personality in whatever stratum of society it exhibits potentialities.

The effort to secure a measure of equality in our society is obvious in legislation and administration which check particular abuses, such as racketeering and the like, but it is also the chief motivating force in the experimental method which has a vaster scope and less immediate results. It exists, too, in the spirit which allows free play of open conflicts and effects their resolution. Experimentation in politics is a bold method of dealing with abuses, while the toleration of conflicts is based upon the assumption that those who feel inequities most acutely ought to be permitted to agitate for their elimination and to organize the means for so doing. The fact that both experimentation and the judicious play of conflict may be cumbersome and inefficient in their achievement of the desired end, indicates that the substance of equality in a world of intricate social relationships is too elusive to be recognized at once with certainty. We know that the concepts of liberty and equality cannot be static in a changing world, and that they must now include, for instance, economic security, though there is no simple answer to the problem of how property rights are to be modified in order to reduce the vast inequalities of power. The intricacy of the problem has been recently illustrated by the brief epidemic of sit-down strikes. These tactics could not be treated as analogous to a simple case of trespass, because of the peculiarly intimate relationship of workers to the property of their employers. The sit-down strike may have been conceived as the one way in which a protest against the rigid construction of property rights could be made effectively articulate, and is not dissimilar to the tactics of nullification employed by South Carolina more than a century ago. It may or may not be a passing phase in the tactics of labor, but, if it is used, the answer to it is not a simple assertion of its illegality by judicial power. Neither is the solution to be found in a simple legalization, if only because in some industrial plants that would make possible the undemocratic assertion of the will of a minority over the majority. It is to be regarded as

just one sympton of a growing unwillingness on the part of labor to suffer inequality, and cannot be treated as an isolated phenomenon. The only basic approach to it is through a reconsideration of the problem of liberty and equality in the whole field of labor relations.

The way through this involved problem and others like it is not clear, so long as we continue to regard law as a mere body of fixed rules. Such a static conception has been rejected, however, in the best expositions of a liberal jurisprudence that we have had in recent times. Dean Roscoe Pound has shown that lawyers and judges do not measure the law solely by standards drawn from within the body of law itself, but increasingly take cognizance of the outside world in which the law operates, striving more to satisfy human wants than to limit individual wills. Legal historians know that to enlarge the context of law by taking judicial notice of social and economic facts is not to depart from the spirit of the common law, but to return to it as it was both in its early formative stages and at later times when, with the development of equity, it was being made over by what Pound calls "an infusion of morals." The American atmosphere should be most congenial to a law which functions as a kind of accumulated body of reason developed by judges sensitive to the life of their times. Indeed the essence of such a liberal jurisprudence is to be found in Justice Holmes, who, wise in the law and receptive to ideas and experimentation, never believed that the rôle of a judge was to obstruct the fluidity of social forces.

Although judges, administrators and legislators are the chief instruments of a liberal policy, the citizens in the liberal state are not the passive tools of a policy directed from above. Nor are citizens merely detached observers, and it is among them, of course, that social conflicts occur. Since it is in the nature of modern American liberalism to concede the necessity for social conflict, it follows that liberals cannot find it in them to declare unequivocally that one side is right and one wrong. We cannot conceive of masses of citizens in a lock-step of liberalism. By virtue of the qualities inherent in the liberal state, it is incumbent upon each citizen to decide for himself where his weight should be placed in the pull and push of forces. It is for him to decide whether the organization of a movement or the promotion of an experiment will, on the whole, extend or curtail liberties. We cannot hope that in terms of concrete programs of action American liberalism will mean the same thing to all citizens.

My own opinions on the tumult of political and social conflict center about the realization that in the clash of group interests, the tactical advantages are, in our society, ordinarily with the *status quo*. Those who are interested in its maintenance are the ones who have access to the most powerful weapons; they have the means to employ skilful defenders; they speak through the chief organs of opinion, they can use obstructive maneuvres effectively in all branches of government and can employ police power without the stigma of a direct appeal to force; they can accuse their opponents of stirring up class hatred, they can rely on human inertia and the diversion of public interest, and they can enjoy the tacit alliance of the liberals who pride themselves on their superior detachment. Because of the resulting inequality, American liberalism is, for me, identified with movements for intelligent social change; at the same time I admit that the defenders of the *status quo* include some liberals who emphasize other aspects of social flux and by their very opposition help to preserve the vitality of a liberalism which, through a too widespread acquiescence, might very well become flabby. In other words, it is the total process of conflict, in which there are agreement and compromise, resistance and yielding, even victory and defeat, but never annihilation of any one system of opinion or way of life, which constitutes genuine liberalism.

There is not much that is neat and orderly in this system, but nothing, perhaps, has done more to restore the prestige of its fumbling methods than the submergence of liberalism in parts of western Europe and the spectacle of its alternatives. We know fully now what the individual sacrifices for the outward appearance of order in the one alternative of nationalistic dictatorships. We see the resurgence of energies and the stirring of pride, but we see also a pandering to the little man's sense of the heroic; we see, too, how anachronistic the heroic virtues become in a civilization where the industrial, intellectual and amiable virtues are indispensable to the good life and, in the long run, to survival.

The other alternative is to have the vision and the courage for a fresh start. We have seen in Russia the clean break, the exuberant hopes, the grandiose plans and enormous achievements, but we see now more distinctly the impossibility of separating means and ends. We see how the technique of the revolution becomes the master of the revolutionaries and that they cannot, for the present at least, bring into being the genuine democracy which exists as a fiction in their society. Many

Marxians tell us that the use of force cannot be avoided at some stage in the process of major social change. But if the Marxists were not so mechanical in the reiteration of their belief that the forcible dispossession of the wealthy at some time is inevitable, they would, perhaps, realize that, either its inevitability makes their insistence unnecessary, or their insistence will in the end render it inevitable. They tell us that the upper classes will in any case resort to violence, although the British landed aristocracy accepted its decline with only curses on the evil times, and the old upper classes of Spain will doubtless regard ruefully, whoever is the victor, the inordinate costs and the scanty rewards of their use of force. To be sure, provocation to violence in some states justifies its use, but, even in the liberal state, the Marxists ask us to prepare ourselves psychologically for a technique of force to be used at some crucial time, and then, presumably, at the end to dislike it so heartily that we should rebuild our world in a co-operative spirit. Futile as the war method has increasingly become in modern western states, the Marxists expect it within a state to tide over the most difficult stage in social transition. We are to try all other means first, but apparently without faith that in the end they will be efficacious. Since these other means resolve themselves chiefly into those of liberal democracy, for the present the left-wing critics of liberalism are constantly paying it the compliment of employing its methods.

The "realism" of those who assert the inevitability of violence is based, then, upon fanciful assumptions about human nature and contradictory requirements in human action, so that, by contrast, the liberal faith in the power of organized intelligence does not seem so utopian after all. Liberalism is not so naïve as to maintain that there are final solutions to social problems—the effort to reach provisional ones is painful and difficult enough—and it has the great advantage of co-ordinating its means and ends. Committed as it is in the United States to democratic forms, it possesses its own corrective and recuperative powers. It has the salutary quality of exposing to the scrutiny of a whole people its follies, its weaknesses and its hypocrisies. It may often tolerate negligence and corruption in office, but it frequently turns them to real social advantage in instigating reforms. Our liberal tradition makes impossible the entrenchment of immobile and unregenerate conservatism, since it cannot long survive the public odium of the police and army brutality to which it must resort. We listen by thousands to political charlatans who offer a too easy way out of our difficulties, but we

usually desert them at the polls. No doubt we shall continue to present the appearance of a society of bickering factions, but the underlying unity will be more real than that of an imposed orderliness. For all its apparent lack of efficiency, American liberal democracy is well designed for the intellgent direction of social change, for liberalism is the method of a dynamic society where the spirit of freedom can, in its ever-changing forms, continue to assert itself.

THE ANNUAL MEETING

of

The Baptist Education Society

of the

State of New York

Rochester, N. Y.
May, 1938

MINUTES OF THE ANNUAL MEETING

The 1938 Annual Meeting of the Baptist Education Society of the State of New York was called to order, according to appointment, at the Colgate-Rochester Divinity School, in Rochester, New York, on Monday, May 23, 1938.

In the absence of the President, Mr. Russell Colgate, of West Orange, New Jersey, presided. Prayer was offered by the Reverend Paul Swarthout.

The minutes of the previous meeting were presented by the Secretary, in printed form, and were adopted. The Treasurer of the Society, and the President of the Divinity School both presented their annual reports in printed form, made comments and answered questions. Thereupon they were adopted and approved by unanimous vote.

Mr. A. J. Gosnell, chairman of the Nominating Committee appointed one year ago, presented the report of that Committee. Tellers were appointed, and the members of the Society voted by ballot. The following were elected to the office specified.

President

RUSSELL COLGATE ..... West Orange, N. J.

First Vice-President

WILLIAM S. ABERNETHY ..... Washington, D. C.

Second Vice-President

EARL F. ADAMS ..... Buffalo, N. Y.

Honorary Vice-Presidents

ARTHUR M. HARRIS ..... Plainfield, N. J.
CORWIN S. SHANK ..... Seattle, Wash.
CHARLES C. TILLINGHAST ..... New York, N. Y.
JOSEPH C. HAZEN ..... Summit, N. J.

Secretary

GLENN B. EWELL ..... Rochester, N. Y.

Treasurer

ARTHUR J. GOSNELL ..... Rochester, N. Y.

Trustees for Three Years from May, 1938

FREDERICK ALLEN ..... Troy, N. Y.
ARTHUR A. HARTSHORN ..... Hamilton, N. Y.
ORRIN R. JUDD ..... Brooklyn, N. Y.
G. FRED LAUBE ..... Rochester, N. Y.
ORLO J. PRICE ..... Pittsford, N. Y.
CHARLES H. SEARS ..... New York, N. Y.
AVERY A. SHAW ..... Granville, Ohio
ARTHUR CASTLE ..... Rochester, N. Y.
GILBERT J. C. McCURDY ..... Rochester, N. Y.
HOMER P. RAINEY ..... Washington, D.C.
LUTHER WESLEY SMITH ..... Syracuse, N. Y.
JAMES M. SPINNING ..... Rochester, N. Y.

Trustee for One Year from May, 1938

CHARLES T. DePUY ..... Rochester, N. Y.

The Vice-President appointed the following as the Nominating Committee to report at the annnual meeting of 1939: Messrs. Gosnell, Cutten and Arthur Castle.

Adjourned.

Glenn B. Ewell, *Secretary.*

THE ANNUAL REPORT TO THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES

BY

PRESIDENT ALBERT W. BEAVEN

May 23, 1938

To the Members of the Board of Trustees of the Baptist Education Society of the State of New York:

Gentlemen of the Board of Trustees:

THIS is the ninth annual report which I have submitted to you in my capacity as President.

During the year we have had an exceptionally large student body, and, I may say, a splendid spirit of co-operation among Faculty and students. There has been an increase in the general seriousness of all of us, I believe, in the quest of the richer spiritual insights of life. Various events upon the campus, and the critical nature of the world situation, have conduced to this. It has been noticeable in the chapel services of the year, in prayer meetings among the students, and in the inauguration by the Third Year class of a special early-morning period when a goodly number of them have spent a half-hour in prayer and meditation, as a group, in an upper room of the school building.

I cannot but comment this year also, upon what I believe is the increased service which we rendered to the students by the initiating of the personality tests at the beginning of the year, in connection with our orientation work, through which a natural contact is formed between each student and Professor Baker, who presides over the test. This makes it simple and easy for students to talk over with him their particular problems. In turn, he is enabled, usually, to secure their agreement to refer personal problems to me, or to some other members of the Faculty who can be of particular help. For several years prior to the inauguration of this scheme, I was conscious of a great lack in this area. Students came to the School aware of many problems within their own personalities, but not until they had been here for some time and had become very well acquainted with some one professor did it seem natural and easy for them to confide, or to seek relief from the difficulties which harassed them.

I mention also the work done last summer under the auspices of the Council for Clinical Training, where several of our students under the supervision of Professor Baker, and several students from other institutions, worked in a clinical training relationship both in the State Hospital of Rochester and in the County Hospital. The results were decidedly satisfactory. The Committee on Instruction recommend to you that Assistant Professor Baker, who received his doctor's degree from the University of Chicago since last commencement, be advanced to the status of Associate Professor as of June first of this year, and that his salary be increased $200.00.

I am deeply pleased with the influence of Professor Nixon on the campus. I am sure that his service to our students already is creative and constructive.

I wish to pay my tribute to the members of the Faculty. Through the year each one has not only carried his own share of work, but a rather heavy share in the general work of the School, through the various committees into which the Faculty is divided. During the year Professor Moehlman gave an important address in connection with the one hundredth anniversary of the founding of the University of Michigan at Ann Arbor. As you know, Professor Evans was away on his leave of absence during the fall semester, and Professor Robins has been absent this spring semester; Professor Cross and Professor Moehlman have had their leaves of absence and programs for the first and second semesters, respectively, of next year approved by the Executive Committee. Professor Parsons reached the age of sixty-five during this school year. By your action of a year ago, he was invited to remain for the next school year, 1938–39. We now bring you a recommendation from the Committee on Instruction to extend him an invitation to remain during the school year 1939–40. Professor Vichert, who becomes sixty-five on August 10, 1939, has notified us that he prefers, unless it is imperative from our point of view for him to remain longer, that he be released at that time, to carry out plans which he has in mind.

At our annual meeting of a year ago you were notified of my plans for my own sabbatical leave. These plans were carried out, and I want, before I speak of the results of the trip, to express appreciation to Dean Wearing and especially Dean Ewell for carrying the additional load of administrative work made necessary by my absence. In my letters addressed to you I have reported somewhat upon the world

tour made during that period. My object, as you know, was to make contacts with our alumni upon the foreign field, as far as possible, in order to establish such relationships with them as we have with the alumni in this country. I hoped to make them realize that the School is profoundly interested in what they are undertaking, to bring them greetings from the institution, and to hearten them in their work. For my own part, I hoped to learn as much as I could about the missionary enterprise as a possible professional task for young men in the Divinity School who would be seeking my advice as to their entry into this field of service.

Supplementing my letters to you, let me report my conclusion that these contacts are proving of inestimable value to me in my capacity as President of the institution. I believe the visitation was a source of help and encouragement to those of our alumni who frequently feel that they are so far removed as to be out of touch with the life and purposes of the institution. In South India, in Bengal-Orissa, in Burma and in Japan, we had peculiar opportunities for seeing the alumni. Mrs. Beaven went with me on every occasion. The two largest groups that we met were those in Burma and in Japan. The former group, meeting in connection with the Burma Baptist Convention at Bassein, was gathered in the home of Reverend and Mrs. Lee W. Spring, of the Class of 1906. Mr. Spring has recently been honored by the King in being presented with the Kaiser-I-Hind Medal. Some fourteen or fifteen people, including wives, were together at a dinner, among them two of our quite recent graduates, Reverend and Mrs. Cecil Hobbs, who were appointed and went to Burma in 1935. In Japan, the gathering was held in the home of Dr. William Axling, of the Class of 1901, one of our distinguished alumni, who showed us many courtesies, and through whose influence I was able not only to talk frankly with many of our Christian leaders, but with officials of the government. I feel that it was a singularly useful series of experiences; and the fact that we were well throughout the entire trip, and that we had no accidents or difficulties during that period, we feel to have been somewhat phenomenal.

I am very glad to report to you that as nearly as the physicians can judge, the events of the trip had nothing to do with Mrs. Beaven's illness and home-going, which occurred on the fifteenth of April. The basic disease which caused her going had been active for approximately fifteen years. It is designated ulcerative colitis. Both of us had

known that sometime it would win in the struggle which she made for continuing health. We were aware how closely she came to the edge two years ago, and it still seems marvelous that she could have been restored at that time. Particularly it seems miraculous that she should have been given two years of apparently radiant health, and have been enabled to make a trip which had been her dream—and to complete it without noticeable physical limitation; indeed, she seemed more free from her sickness during that period that at any other time in the last ten years. After our return she seemed remarkably well, and we were enabled, in the two and a half months before this came upon her, to complete the full schedule of entertainment events which normally would have been stretched out over the entire year. Particularly did she enjoy the dinners with the seniors. Eight of those evenings were given to formal dinners, followed by an entire evening during which we talked over their life at the School, the enterprise upon which they were about to embark, the homes they were to start, and the messages they were to give. Again, we do not know that this program had any relationship to her final going, but we do know that during the years of her sojourn in the Montgomery House she was able to minister in a rather important way to the lives of the students. Each Wednesday afternoon we kept "open house." The Faculty wives, the wives of the students, and, as you know, from time to time the Faculty and the Trustees themselves, were made to feel at home there. I feel that I am not overstating it when I say, she had a large place in the life of the School.

I deeply appreciate the evidences of fellowship shown me by members of the Board and of the Faculty during the days that have just passed.

At another point death has entered our ranks this year in the going of Dr. Ambrose Swasey. Dr. Swasey had been President of the Society since May, 1924. Though he had not been able to be present at the annual meetings for the last few years, his interest in the institution had not lagged. It will be recalled that it was through his gift that our present Library building was erected, and through his interest that a large share of the library endowment was obtained. An eminent engineer and scientist, a successful man of affairs, entrusted with large wealth, he nevertheless did not lose his simple, direct faith nor his contact with his church, and was profoundly interested in the work of this Society.

Our Standing as an Institution

One interesting feature of this past year has been the revelation of our standing as put against the standards adopted by the American Association of Theological Schools of the United States and Canada, through its Committee on Accreditation. This organization of theological schools is creating standards by which schools may measure themselves, a service such as is rendered by the standardizing agencies to universities and colleges. As a result of investigations applied to something over fifty of the leading theological schools of the country, we have been informed unofficially that our standing will give us great cause for satisfaction. We may not make public yet the findings of the Committee, which must report first to the Association meeting in Toronto June 13–15. I myself have served on the Committee of Accreditation, and, though strenuous work, it has been a useful bit of education for me.

Finance

The problems of finance will be dealt with at length by the Treasurer and the Assistant Treasurer. I pay tribute again to the care with which the Finance Committee is dealing with the problems involved, and express the appreciation of the institution for the amount of time and thought which they are giving to our investments and to the properties which we have been forced to take over. Mr. Carson has made himself increasingly useful during the year. It is evident from the studies that are being made, that institutions depending upon endowment will probably have to face the certainty of a shrinkage of income. We have already taken certain steps toward retrenchment, and are giving serious thought to ways both of increasing our income and of decreasing our outgo.

In this connection it might be reported that some consideration must be given to the financial section of the agreement entered into by the Education Society with the Educational Convention of the German Baptists in America, and adopted by this Board at its annual meeting in May, 1931. In view of the existing financial conditions, and in view of the changed prospects for the German Baptist Seminary, it is imperative that this agreement come under review to determine (a) whether there should be a revision of the section dealing with the income from their invested funds, and our supplemental contribution to

their support; (b) the action of our Society if the German Baptist Seminary should decide to relocate so as to be in closer relationship to a school of collegiate rank and privileges; and (c) our obligation as to allowances for their retired professors.

Library

From the report of Professor Trost, the librarian, I note the following items: An appropriation of $2500 was made for the purchase of books during the present fiscal year. Of this, $700 was allotted for the purchase of periodicals. The total number of accessions amounted to 1525 volumes. He says:

"Significant purchases during the year include the new edition of the *Encyclopedia Americana* in thirty volumes, replacing the older edition. Particularly helpful as a bibliographical aid is *A Short-Title Catalogue of Books Printed in England, Scotland, and Ireland and of English Texts Printed Abroad, 1475–1640,* compiled by A. W. Pollard and G. R. Redgreve. The library was fortunate in obtaining a nearly complete copy of the *Protestant Magazine,* published in New York from September, 1833 to August, 1834. Our copy lacks but two issues (May and June, 1834). Brown University Library is the only library in the United States which has the complete volume. Our copy is the second most complete copy in any American library.

"Among the gifts received were several dozen early *Baptist Association Minutes* which were presented to us by the Samuel Colgate Historical Collection at Hamilton. Through the kindness of Mrs. E. C. Sondericker the library obtained several early volumes (bound) of the Atlantic Monthly (v. 3–12) as well as two bound volumes of Harpers for 1856.

"Circulation figures reached an all-high figure 21,456. In addition 1883 slides were loaned, or a grand total of 22,339 books and slides. This represents an increase of 3410 volumes over last year. Reserve books issued for overnight use amounted to 5838, or an increase of 653. Evening attendance (including Saturday afternoon) reached an all-time high 4982, or 930 more than were present during the school term 1936–37, and 2054 more than were present during the school term 1935–36.

"Because of the current interest manifested in China, an exhibit of Chinese curios was arranged in the early fall. Of unusual delight were the several carved Chinese figures depicting practically all phases of Chinese life. The library is grateful to Dr. and Mrs. Joseph Taylor

for the loan of Chinese costumes, embroidery, and porcelain. A lovely Chinese silver water pipe was loaned by Mr. Bryan F. Archibald. The present exhibit depicts the development of the Bible in translation. Several illuminated manuscript leaves are on display in the library foyer.

"The service afforded by the Alumni Lending Library has increased its circulation 33⅓% over the previous year. The printing of new accessions in the *News Sheet* of the *Bulletin* has been a significant factor in calling to the attention of alumni books of merit. The continuance of this service is enthusiastically recommended.

"The Librarian was privileged to attend the annual meeting of the American Library Association held in New York City in June. At that Conference he presented a paper before the Religious Books Section of the Association on 'Some Significant Periodical Articles in the Field of Religion, 1936–37.' This address in abridged form appears in the American Library Association *Bulletin* for October 15, 1937."

Extra-Mural Work

From the report of Professor Vichert, the head of our department on Extra-Mural Work, I present the following extracts:

"The year has brought enlargement of our work and extension into certain new areas. Several churches have been added to the list of those served by student pastors, and an increased number of churches have given some measure of remuneration to students under our scholarship arrangement. The Y.M.C.A. has this year employed five of our students and has reported very favorably on the service rendered. Since December first 'Church Chimes' hour over WSAY has been conducted by our men every Monday morning. In addition there have been numerous calls for occasional addresses. I have arranged for nearly fifty of these, and there probably were many others of which I did not have knowledge. Thus in various directions our student work has been extended and it has elicited a volume of grateful appreciation.

Student Pastors

"Students have been serving as pastors forty-three churches during the year. The denominational distribution of the churches is as follows: Baptist 18, Methodist 8, Community 5, Presbyterian 4, Friends 3, Christian 2, Congregational 2, Evangelical 1.

Scholarships

"The number of students on scholarships does not remain a constant throughout the year, as occasional changes occur. From first to last we have had approximately sixty-five engaged in some form of practical service under our scholarship arrangements. Of these eighteen are full co-operatives, the largest number we have ever had. In addition numerous churches have afforded remuneration in amounts varying from $50 to $200.

"The demand for the services of our students constantly grows and comes from churches representing nearly all the leading Protestant groups. Ten denominations were represented in the churches employing students this year. That does much, in my judgment, to promote sympathetic understanding and inter-denominational fellowship. The cordial and appreciative reports which I receive both from the students and from those with whom they serve would indicate that the relationships are happy, and that the young men are both rendering useful service, and gaining helpful experience.

"Once more I should like to express my gratitude to Reverend Alfred E. Isaac, the retiring secretary of the Baptist Union of Rochester and Monroe County, for his helpful and sympathetic co-operation. The students have had no better friend than he. It is a pleasure to report that his successor, Reverend Albert R. DeMott, has also manifested his deep interest in the work of the students and has already made some suggestions which look to maintaining a constructive and progressive program which will not be interrupted by changes in pastorates."

Auburn Theological Seminary

I am in receipt of the following communication from the Board of Trustees of the Auburn Theological Seminary:

"The Board of Directors of the Auburn Theological Seminary wishes to inform the Board of Trustees of the Baptist Education Society of the State of New York that it has been urgently prosecuting the campaign for funds to move Auburn Seminary into co-operation with the Colgate-Rochester Divinity School in accordance with the plan adopted by the Boards of the two institutions. During the year 1937–1938, $98,000 has been raised in subscriptions and pledges and the territory of the campaign has not been completely covered as yet. It has become clear that due to economic conditions, the full amount of the goal of the

campaign cannot be attained in the immediate future. The Board of Directors of Auburn would therefore request that new discussions be entered upon between delegated committees seeking the affiliation of the two institutions on a somewhat different basis than that originally planned.

"The Board of Directors of Auburn Seminary respectfully propose that these committees investigate the possibility of a plan which would bring Auburn Seminary into affiliation with the Colgate-Rochester Divinity School in the present plant and equipment of the Divinity School, thus permitting Auburn to give up for the present a building program. Such a plan would contemplate the retention of the separate identity of each institution as a distinct corporate body, holding its own property, receiving its own students, employing its own faculty, conferring its own degrees, maintaining its own denominational relationships. The plan would, however, set up a single unified curriculum, available to the students of both institutions and contributed to equitably by the faculties of both institutions. Further, the operation of the combined affairs of the institutions in this unified curriculum and mingled student body would be under a unified administrative control.

"Provided the negotiating committees could find such a basis of affiliation, they would at the earliest possible moment present to their respective Boards details by which such a plan could be carried out and put into effect."

This request will no doubt have your serious thought in the meeting of today.

Degrees

During the past academic year the degree of Doctor of Philosophy has been conferred upon two of the alumni of this Divinity School, both of whom have been holders of our Graduate Scholarships and Fellowships. The first was upon F. Bredahl Petersen, M.A., B.D., by the University of Edinburgh; the second upon Mark Rich, M.A., B.D., by Cornell University. Both of these gentlemen have done scholastic work which is a credit to themselves and to this School.

The Faculty recommends, for the year beginning May 1, 1938, the granting of Fellowships to Gaylord Pierce Albaugh, of the Class of 1936, to continue his work for the doctorate at the University of Chicago; to Robert Haddow Beaven, to continue his work at Cambridge University, England, looking toward his doctor's degree; to Clyde

Amos Holbrook, to complete the requirements of a doctorate at Yale University; and to Winthrop Still Hudson, to continue his work for the doctorate at the University of Chicago.

The Faculty also recommends the following for Graduate Scholarships: Kenneth Leroy Maxwell, to begin work in the University of Cambridge, England, looking toward his doctor's degree there; Donato Ruiz Ramirez, to spend one semester in special work in Spanish Literature and Composition at the National University of Mexico; Paul Gerhardt Schade, to begin work toward a doctorate at Yale University; Nobuo Tokita, to do special work in Rikkyo University, Japan; Edwin H. Tuller, for study under the Faculte libre de Theologie Protestante, Paris.

In accordance with the action of the Faculty, I recommend that the degree of Bachelor of Divinity be conferred upon the following members of the graduating class, since they have fulfilled all the requirements as candidates for this degree:

Bryan Frederick Archibald
Jacques Valentin Beaudon
James Benjamin Brown
Millard Ray Brown
M. Parker Burroughs
Wilbur Carl Christians
Donald Neil Duncan
Buford Byron Fordham
Benjamin Franklin Garmer
George Andrew Haddad
Charles Frederick Kemp
Robert Lee Kincheloe
Bruce McDonald Lambert
Isaac Vincent Lloyd
Kenneth Leroy Maxwell
Carl Eugene McAllister
David Robert McKechnie
Rowe Burrell Million
Walter Sylvester Peck
Paul Gardiner Perkins
Donato Ruiz Ramirez
John Daniel Rein
Paul Gerhardt Schade
Ralph Henry Seguine
Floyd Alfred Smith
Stanley Eugene Smith
Lucius Miles Tobin
Stanley Vincent Todd
Edwin Hurlbut Tuller
Gifford Milo Webster
Clifford Jackson Young

Yours fraternally,
ALBERT W. BEAVEN,
President.

INDEX TO BULLETIN

VOLUME X

Title Index

The Annual Meeting of the Baptist Education Society, pp. 311–313.

The Annual Report of the President to the Board of Trustees, by Albert W. Beaven, pp. 314–323.

Activity and Worship, by Herbert W. Schneider, pp. 34–41.

The Appreciation of Hebrew Poetry, by Earle B. Cross, pp. 42–52.

Baptist Theological Education in New York State, by Glenn B. Ewell, pp. 69–82.

The Catalogue, No. 3c, March, 1938.

The Communion of Saints, by Henry B. Robins, pp. 94–105.

In Defence of Optimism, by Conrad H. Moehlman, pp. 25–33.

The Function of Religion in Relating Specific and Ultimate Objectives in Socio-Economic Conflict, by Oren H. Baker, pp. 156–163.

Impressions of a Troubled World, by Albert W. Beaven, pp. 117–124.

The Meaning of Liberalism for Americans, by Willson H. Coates, pp. 297–310.

More Than Conqueror, Memorial Services for Grace Haddow Beaven, pp. 259–268.

Rhode Island and Democracy, by Orrin B. Judd, pp. 83–93.

The Significance and Function of the Church, by Justin W. Nixon, pp. 146–155.

Thinking Realistically About Religion, by Henry B. Robins, pp. 5–24.

What About Evangelism? by David J. Evans, pp. 125–145; 269–296.

Contributors

Baker, Oren H.: The Function of Religion in Relating Specific and Ultimate Objectives in Socio-Economic Conflict, pp. 156–163.

Beaven, Albert W.: Impressions of a Troubled World, pp. 117–124.

Coates, Willson H.: The Meaning of Liberalism for Americans, pp. 297–310.

Cross, Earle B.: The Appreciation of Hebrew Poetry, pp. 42–52.

Evans, David J.: What About Evangelism? pp. 125–145; 269–296.

Ewell, Glenn B.: Baptist Theological Education in New York State; a Genetic Survey, pp. 69–82.

Judd, Orrin B.: Rhode Island and Democracy, pp. 83–93.

Moehlman, Conrad H.: In Defence of Optimism, pp. 25–33.

Nixon, Justin W.: The Significance and Function of the Church, pp. 146–155.

Robins, Henry B.: The Communion of Saints, pp. 94–105.

Robins, Henry B.: Thinking Realistically About Religion, pp. 5–24.

Schneider, Herbert W.: Activity and Worship, pp. 34–41.

Books Reviewed

Andrews, C. F., Christ and Prayer, pp. 173–174.

Atkinson, H. A., Prelude to Peace, p. 174.

Bainton, R. H., David Joris: Wiedertäufer und Kämpfer für Toleranz Im 16. Jahrhundert, p. 107.

Beaven, A. W., The Local Church, pp. 57–58.

Beiler, I. R., Studies in the Life of Jesus, pp. 53–54.

Berry, G. R., Higher Criticism and the Old Testament, p. 173.

Bewkes, E. G., Legacy of a Christian Mind, pp. 62–64.

Bixler, J. S., ed., The Nature of Religious Experience, pp. 60–61.

Black, M. M., The Pendulum Swings Back, p. 172.

Branscombe, B. H., The Gospel of Mark, pp. 165–166.

Brebner, J. B., The Neutral Yankees of Nova Scotia, p. 64.

Cash, W. W., Christendom and Islam, p. 109.

Casson, Stanley, Progress and Catastrophe, pp. 174–175.

Clark, E. T., The Small Sects in America, p. 168.

Clark, Glenn, I Will Lift Up Mine Eyes, p. 164.

Clark, K. W., A Descriptive Catalogue of Greek New Testament Manuscripts in America, p. 165.

Farelly, Robert, Philémon Vincent: meditation sur sa vie et son oeuvre, pp. 164–165.

Farelly, Robert, La Robe Sans Couture, pp. 59–60.

Fisher, F. B., The Man That Changed the World, p. 111.

Fosdick, H. E., Successful Christian Living, p. 173.

Goslin, R. A., Church and State, pp. 109–110.

Hardman, Oscar, A History of Christian Worship, p. 111.

Harkness, Georgia, The Recovery of Ideals, p. 62.

Hendry, G. S., God the Creator, pp. 168–169.

Hocking, W. E., Thoughts on Death and Life, pp. 61–62.

Lake, Kirsopp and Lake Silva, An Introduction to the New Testament, p. 106.

Landau, Rom, God Is My Adventure, p. 57.

Latourette, K. S., A History of the Expansion of Christianity: Volume I. The First Five Centuries, pp. 108–109.

Lindsay, A. D., The Moral Teaching of Jesus, p. 166.

Lods, Adolphe, The Prophets and the Rise of Judaism, pp. 166–167.

McNeill, J. T., Christian Hope For World Society, p. 168.

Martin, A. D., The Holiness of Jesus, p. 53.

Micklem, Nathaniel, What Is the Faith? pp. 56–57.

The Modern Church School Series: Units 7, 8, and 9, p. 112.

Monsma, P. H., Karl Barth's Idea of Revelation, p. 108.

Moore, J. M., On the Trail of Truth, pp. 169–170.

Morrison, J. D., Minister's Service Book, p. 110.

Morrison, J. H., Christian Faith and the Science of Today, p. 169.

Mueller, A. D., Ethik; Der Evangelische Weg der Verwirklichung des Guten, p. 107.

Mueller, F. E. and Hartshorne, Hugh, Ethical Dilemmas of Ministers, p. 175.

Nehru, Jawaharlal, An Autobiography, pp. 58–59.

Oesterley, W. O. E., A Fresh Approach to the Psalms, pp. 167–168.

Oman, John, Concerning the Ministry, p. 59.

Raffety, W. E., How to Lead a Bible School, p. 112.

Scott, E. F., The Pastoral Epistles, p. 56.

Smith, H. A., ed., The New Church Hymnal, p. 110.

Stocking, J. T., Stocking Tales, p. 112.

Stolz, K. H., The Psychology of Religious Living, pp. 170–171.

Strachan, R. H., The Second Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians, pp. 55–56.

Torrey, C. C., Our Translated Gospels, pp. 54–55.

Underhill, Evelyn, The Spiritual Life, p. 173.

Underhill, Evelyn, Worship, p. 59.

Van Dusen, H. P., et al., Church and State in the Modern World, p. 109.

Wieman, R. W., The Modern Family and the Church, pp. 171–172.

World Conference on Faith and Order, Edinburgh, 1937. Commission on the Church's Unity in Life and Worship; The Meanings of Unity; The Communion of Saints; The Non-Theological Factors in the Making and Unmaking of Church Union; A Decade of Objective Progress in Church Unity, 1927–1936; Next Steps on the Road to a United Church—five reports, p. 64.